

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



3 1761 01553211 2



16 1761 01553211 2





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



PROSPECTUS OF THE THEOLOGICAL TRANSLATION FUND.

As it is important that the best results of recent theological investigations on the Continent, conducted without reference to doctrinal considerations, and with the sole purpose of arriving at truth, should be placed within the reach of English readers, it is proposed to collect, by Subscriptions and Donations, a Fund which shall be employed for the promotion of this object. A good deal has been already effected in the way of translating foreign theological literature, a series of works from the pens of Hengstenberg, Haevernick, Delitzsch, Keil, and others of the same school, having of late years been published in English but—as the names of the authors just mentioned will at once suggest to those who are conversant with the subject—the tendency of these works is for the most part conservative. It is a theological literature of a more independent character, less biassed by dogmatical prepossessions, a literature which is represented by such works as those of Ewald, Hupfeld, F. C. Baur, Zeller, Rothe, Keim, Schrader, Hausrath, Nöldeke, Pfeiderer, &c., in Germany, and by those of Kuenen, Scholten, and others, in Holland, that it is desirable to render accessible to English readers who are not familiar with the languages of the Continent. The demand for works of this description is not as yet so widely extended among either the clergy or the laity of Great Britain as to render it practicable for publishers to bring them out in any considerable numbers at their own risk. And for this reason the publication of treatises of this description can only be secured by obtaining the co-operation of the friends of free and unbiassed theological inquiry.

It is hoped that at least such a number of Subscribers of *One Guinea Annually* may be obtained as may render it practicable for the Publishers, as soon as the scheme is fairly set on foot, to bring out every year *three 8vo. volumes*, which each Subscriber of the above amount would be entitled to receive gratis. But as it will be necessary to obtain, and to remunerate, the services of a responsible Editor, and in general, if not invariably, to pay the translators, it would conduce materially to the speedy success of the design, if free donations were also made to the Fund; or if contributors were to subscribe for more than one copy of the works to be published.

If you approve of this scheme, you are requested to communicate with Messrs. Williams and Norgate, 14, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London, and to state whether you are willing to subscribe; and if you are disposed to assist further, what would be the amount of your donation, or the number of additional copies of the publications which you would take.

We are, your obedient servants,

JOHN TULLOCH,	H. J. S. SMITH,
H. B. WILSON,	H. SIDGWICK,
B. JOWETT,	JAMES HEYWOOD,
A. P. STANLEY,	C. KEGAN PAUL,
W. G. CLARK,	J. ALLANSON PICTON,
S. DAVIDSON,	ROBT. WALLACE,
JAMES MARTINEAU,	LEWIS CAMPBELL,
JOHN CAIRD,	RUSSELL MARTINEAU,
EDWARD CAIRD,	T. K. CHEYNE,
JAMES DONALDSON,	J. MUIR.

The number of Subscribers is as yet far from that required to cover the cost of the undertaking. But it is hoped that a considerable accession will accrue as soon as the progress of the scheme is further advanced.

A Committee selected from the signatories of the original Prospectus agreed upon the works to commence the series. Of these, the following were published in

The First Year's (1873) Subscription :

KEIM (TH.), HISTORY OF JESUS OF NAZARA. Considered in its connection with the National Life of Israel, and related in detail. Second Edition, re-translated by Arthur Ransom. Vol. I.

BAUR (F. C.), PAUL, THE APOSTLE OF JESUS CHRIST, his Life and Work, his Epistles and Doctrine. A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity. Second Edition, by Rev. Allan Menzies. Vol. I.

KUENEN (A.), THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL TO THE FALL OF THE JEWISH STATE. Translated by A. H. May. Vol. I.

The Second Year's (1874) volumes consist of—

KUENEN'S RELIGION OF ISRAEL. Vol. II. Translated by A. H. May.

BAUR'S PAUL; the second and concluding volume. Translated by the Rev. Allan Menzies; and,

BLEEK'S LECTURES ON THE APOCALYPSE. Edited by the Rev. Dr. S. Davidson.

The Third Year (1875) embraces—

KUENEN'S RELIGION OF ISRAEL; the third and concluding volume.

EWALD'S COMMENTARY ON THE PROPHETS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Translated by the Rev. J. Frederick Smith. Vol. I.

ZELLER, THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES CRITICALLY EXAMINED. To which is prefixed, Overbeck's Introduction from De Wette's Handbook, translated by Joseph Dare, B.A. (in 2 vols.). Vol. I.

The Fourth Year (1876) consists of—

ZELLER'S ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Vol. II. and last.

KEIM'S HISTORY OF JESUS OF NAZARA. Vol. II. Translated by the Rev. E. M. Geldart.

EWALD'S PROPHETS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Vol. II.

Beyond these, the following Works are in the hands of Translators, and will be included in the next years' Subscriptions :

BAUR'S FIRST THREE CENTURIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

A SHORT PROTESTANT COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT ;
including Introductions to the Books, by Lipsius, Holsten,
Lang, Pfeiderer, Holtzmann, Hilgenfeld, and others.

HAUSRATH'S HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TIMES. Trans-
lated by the Rev. C. J. Poynting.

PFLEIDERER'S PAULINISMUS, translated by Edward Peters, Esq.

The Third Volume of KEIM'S HISTORY OF JESUS, translated by
A. Ransom ; and

The following Volumes of EWALD'S PROPHETS, translated by the
Rev. J. Frederick Smith.

As a means of increasing the number of Subscribers, it has been suggested to us that many of the present supporters will probably be able to furnish us with lists of persons of liberal thought, to whom we would send the Prospectus. We shall thankfully receive such lists.

WILLIAMS & NORGATE.

14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN,
LONDON, W.C.

THEOLOGICAL
TRANSLATION FUND LIBRARY.

VOL. XI.

KEIM'S
HISTORY OF JESUS OF NAZARA.

VOL. II.



THE HISTORY
OF
JESUS OF NAZARA.

CONSIDERED
IN ITS CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL LIFE OF ISRAEL,
AND RELATED IN DETAIL.

BY
DR. THEODOR KEIM.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY THE REV. E. M. GELDART.

VOL. II.



130364
—
20/12/10

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,
14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;
AND 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

1876.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

WHAT can a translator say about his work that is not either superfluous or impertinent, or both? If he declares his general sympathy with the author, he is liable to be credited also with his particular opinions; if he indicates divergence, he is exceeding his province. If he praises the brilliance or lucidity of the original, he challenges attention to the dulness or the errors of his version. If he complains of obscurity, woe betide him at the hands of the critic who discovers that obscurity solely in the rendering, or the obtuseness that fails to render. In view of these various dilemmas it only remains for me as a translator to confess what I have tried to do. And at the risk of exposure to keener criticism, I make bold to state that the standard at which I have aimed has been a high one. I have endeavoured to treat Keim as I would treat a classical author; to reproduce, as far as my mastery of idiom would allow, both the letter and the spirit of his writing. I have seldom considered myself at liberty to suppress a particle, or to recast a sentence. I have endeavoured to give the swing and rhythm of his language, and have not even shrunk from imitating his mannerisms, and the jingle of words in which he occasionally indulges. I am aware, though only imperfectly,

how far I am from having realised my ideal. If while approximating the same, I have not been betrayed into many egregious blunders, if most of the more serious mistakes shall have been accounted for in the Table of Errata appended to this volume, if finally amid the serried ranks of bristling annotations, the references, so far as I am concerned, shall be found on the whole correct, I shall be devoutly thankful. Meanwhile, far from craving indulgence, I invite the kind reader to point out, for the sake of a possible future edition, any further inaccuracies

Quas aut incuria fudit,
Aut humana parum cavit natura.

E. M. GELDART.

September, 1876.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

THE HISTORY OF JESUS.

PART II.

	PAGE.
TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE	v
THE SACRED YOUTH	1
Division I. The Home	1
Section 1. The Province	1
Section 2. The Country Town	15
Section 3. The Parental House	22
Division II. The Cradle	38
Section 1. The Human Birth	39
Section 2. The Legend of the Childhood	68
Section 3. Place and Time of Birth	101
Division III. The Years of Pupilage	131
Section 1. The School	131
Section 2. The Personality	166

PART III.

SELF-RECOGNITION AND DECISION	201
Section I. The New Prophet in Israel	201
1. John the Baptist's Antecedents	204
2. The Appearance of the Baptist in the Wilderness	227
α. The Preacher in the Wilderness	227
β. The Assembly of Consecration in the Wilderness	254

	PAGE.
Section II. The Prophet and the Neophyte from Nazara	266
1. The Baptism of Jesus	266
2. The Retirement of Jesus	300
Section III. The Prophet in Prison, the Messiah in Galilee	329
1. John at Machærus	329
2. Jesus in Capernaum	347
3. The Great Year in the World's History	379

PART II.

THE SACRED YOUTH.

FIRST DIVISION.—THE HOME.

1.—THE PROVINCE.

THE home of Jesus, and at the same time the historically momentous scene of his work on earth, was the northern district of Palestine,—Galilee.* It lay some distance from Jerusalem, not less than three days' journey, or between 30 and 40 leagues, and owed its name, on repeated occasions, to that motley mingling of nations, which is wont to take place where frontiers meet, and which in this case cut off from the inhabitants the boast of purity in blood or manners.†

Already in the historical books of the Old Testament we meet with the name Galil or Galilah, while in Isaiah the fuller

* Cf. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 15, 1, 3 (Western Asia), 2nd Ed. 1850, p. 282. Arnold, *Palästina*, Herzog, xi. 32 f.

† The nearest way from Galilee to Jerusalem through Samaria 3 days (*τρισι γὰρ ἡμέραις ἀπὸ Γ. ἐνεστὶν οὕτως εἰς Ἱεροσ. καταλῦσαι*). Jos. Vit. 52. The fixed point is there Gabara or Sogane, somewhat to the north (north-west towards Tyrus and Giscala) from the Lake of Gennesaret (cf. Vit. 10. 25. 45. 47). A more accurate detailment is given by the following points. Scythopolis at the south end of Galilee 600 stades (= 30 leagues) from Jerusalem, 2 Macc. xii. 29. The capital Tiberias, (like Nazara) 120 stades from Scythopolis, Vit. 65 (6 leagues). Capernaum 2-3 leagues from Tiberias. Distance between Jerusalem and Tiberias 35, Capernaum 38-39 leagues. By forced days' journeys (cf. Jos. Ant. 15, 8, 5, who reckons from Jerusalem to Samaria, 16 leagues at all events, a day's journey) one might reach Jerusalem, from South Galilee at least, in two days. A Roman detachment marched without stopping between Jerusalem and Antipatris by a night march (about 18 leagues). Acts xxiii. 31 ff.

appellation "Galil (*i.e.* 'Circle') of the Gentiles," first explains the meaning of the name.* That name is however not to be expounded in the same sense as that of the northerly and purely gentile town, "Harosheth of the Gentiles.†"

In this "Heathen District" there were Jewish dwellers.

The Land of Galil was originally only one part of a larger whole, *viz.*, northern Palestine, the north-west of the northernmost tribe, Naphtali, to the right of the springs of the Jordan: a strip of it probably reached beyond the mountains of Naphtali right into the more westerly territory of the tribe of Asher, which abuts on Tyre.‡ The centre of the country was formed by an Israelitish town, Kedesh in the mountains of Naphtali, the home of Barak, Deborah's partner in conquest: but these northern tribes had never from the first succeeded in out-rooting the Canaanitish aborigines, but had merely effected settlements among them, made them to some extent tributary, and planted centres of Jewish faith in the midst of places bearing heathen and Canaanitish names. In this state of things it was no great trial for Solomon to cede twenty towns of Galilee in the neighbourhood of Tyre to King Hiram of that city, as an acknowledgment for his help in building the Temple, considering that they were inhabited chiefly by Phœnicians, and consisting besides of mountain land, were poor enough to disgust the Tyrian even as a gift. "I have no pleasure therein," he is reputed to have said, whence, so the wits would have it, came the Phœnician name of the district Chabulon, perpetuated to this day in the village Kabul near Ptolemais.§

* Joshua xx. 7, xxi. 32, Isa. ix. 1. † Judges iv. 2 ff. (Sisera's residence).

‡ Cf. the geographical definition, 2 Kings xv. 29: *haggalilah, kol erets Naphtali*.

§ Cf. the independent kingdom of Hazor on the Lake of Merom at the time of Joshua and Barak, Joshua xi. f. Judges, v. f. Also localities like Bethshemesh (House of the Sun) and Beth dagon (House of the Fish-God Dagon) in the territory of the tribe of Naphtali and Asher (Joshua xix.), again near there a Migdal El (Tower of God) and a valley of "God's opening" (Jiphtach El) Ib. Cf. below the name Genesar. Kedesh baggalil, Joshua xx. 7, 1 Chron. vi. 61, Joseph. Ant. 13, 5, 6 (between Tyre and Galilee). B. J. 2, 18, 1 (*κίδασα ἡ Τυρίων*). Solo-

The severance from the House of David and from Jerusalem under the Kings of the North, which dated from 975 B.C., followed by the Assyrian captivity, changed the face of the districts: and among the first prisoners of the Asiatic conquerors about 740 B.C., had been the northern tribes, Naphtali along with the dwellers in Galilee, to whose misfortunes Isaiah, with a vigorous stretch of faith it must be confessed, imparted an ideal glory, by anticipating the dawn of Messianic light, to brighten the twofold darkness of their physical and religious horizon.*

After the Exile we find two important changes.

By degrees the Jewish colonists again extended their settlements even in the North, and the name of Galilee enlarged its connotation until it came to cover the whole of the North country on this side the Jordan, so that we may reckon as included in that designation from its southernmost to its northernmost extremes, the tribes of Issachar (with the plain of Jezreel), Zebulon and the southern part of the Lake of Genesaret,—and finally Naphtali and Asher. In the Syrian and Maccabæan periods, the four divisions of the Holy Land were counted as follows:—Judæa the centre, then Samaria, Galilee, and Peræa, or “the yonderland across the Jordan,” forming the three toparchies or provinces. Of these Galilee at all events had outlived by this time its severance from the sanctuary at Jerusalem, which from the time of the division of Solomon’s kingdom had been forced for centuries upon those tribes who occupied what afterwards became Samaritan and Galilæan territory. Though compassed round about by foreign elements, Phœnicia on the west, Syria on the north, Arabia on the east, and cut off on the south from communication with

mon’s cession, 1 Kings ix. 11 (beerets Galil), cf. Jos. c. Apion. 1, 17, Ant. 8, 5, 3 (οὐκ ἀρέσκον). The continuance of Canaanites in these districts, Judges i. 30-33, Gen. xlix. 13.

* Isa. viii. 23, ix. 1. 2 Kings xv. 29. Jos. Ant. 9, 11, 1, already quite regards this Galilee as the later: τὴν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου χώραν καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καλουμένην.

Judæa by the hostile Samaria, whom she shunned, Galilee steadfastly professed the faith of Israel.* The Gentiles, it is true, had also made fresh advances in these northern tracts. Phœnicians, Syrians, Greeks, Arabians, never quite expelled from the first, had struck deep root in the land.† At the time when the Hasmonæans arose, Carmel, Kedesh, yes, even the Mount of Tabor and Gabatha in the centre of Galilee, with Scythopolis in the south, belonged to foreigners, Phœnicians, Syrians and Arabians.‡

By the time of Alexander Jannæus († B.C. 79) much was regained, but not a little was lost again, as for example Carmel, the town of Kedesh, which Josephus calls Syrian possession, and Scythopolis, annexed by Pompey to Syria: and even what was retained was left with a very mongrel population, especially among the colonies established by the Herodæans where adventurers congregated, speaking all kinds of languages; so that the capital Tiberias, for instance, became almost a Greek city.§ Phœnician customs too prevailed on the western border, where Sepphoris was prone to intercourse with Ptolemais, and Zebulon could show splendid buildings like those in Tyre, Sidon and Berytus.|| The name of Galilee, notwithstanding all the changes which time has wrought, has not quite vanished even to this day, from the northern part of the Holy Land. Several places still bear it: there is a Cana Galil, or as it is called in modern Arabic, Kana el Djalil.¶

Nothing was more natural than that savour of contempt with

* Age of the Maccabees, 1 Macc. v. 15, Jos. Ant. 13; 2, 3. 5, 6. Boundaries of Galilee, B. J. 3, 3, 1.

† Jos. Ant. 13, 15, 4, B. J. 3, 3, 2. Also Strabo, 16, 2, 34: ὑπὸ φύλων οἰκούμενα μικτῶν: he counts Phœnicians, Syrians, Arabians.

‡ Jos. Ant. 13, 15, 4 (Tabor). B. J. 2, 18, 1 (Kedesh), Ant. 13, 1, 4 (cf. 13, 9, 1), Gabatha, 14, 44, 4, B. J. 2, 18, 3 ff. Vit. 6 (Scythopolis). The Maccabæan conflicts in Galil Haggoiim (οἱ ἀλλογενεῖς τῶν Γαλ.), 1 Macc. v. 15, Jos. Ant. 12, 8, 1 f. 13, 2, 3. 5, 6.

§ As to these gains see Ant. 13, 15, 4. Carmel, Kedesh and so forth, B. J. 3, 3, 1. Ant. 18, 1, 1. Scythopolis, see above. Tiberias cf. Vit. 12.

|| B. J. 2, 18, 9. Sepphoris, Jos. Vit. 22, cf. its whole conduct in the Jewish war.

¶ Cf. Sepp, Jerusalem II, 100. Rüetschi A. Kana, Vol. vii. 235. K. el Jelil.

which the Jews of pure pedigree regarded the mongrel Galilæans. Such modes of gauging one another were common to oriental peoples, but the sacred community which had newly arisen from out the midst of the Gentiles was a still more diligent censor of genealogies. Apart from this, Judæa and Jerusalem swelled with conscious self-importance when they contrasted themselves with the "country people" ('Am Ha'arets) who had no far-famed temple, and no primitive teachers, and whose peculiarities of religious observance, though here and there preferable to those of Judæa, were "bad," for the simple reason that the capital did not prescribe them. This accumulation of arrogance found vent in many a laugh at the expense of the language of Galilee, which resembled that of the Syrian Lowlands.* It was thrown in the teeth of the Galilæans, that they could not speak correctly or clearly; that they confounded all the gutturals, and even B and K, and it was a favourite pastime to make jokes about the thousand mistakes for which this unfortunate language was answerable, and which proved it lamentably inadequate as a vehicle of doctrinal tradition. The marks of this contempt were borne even by Christianity from its commencement. Ridicule of the language, culture and capacity of Galilee and the little town of Nazareth is continued from the first appearance of Jesus till his death upon the Cross; yes, till the first Pentecost, and for centuries afterwards, down to the time of Julian the Apostate.† Still earlier traces are not wanting. Even Isaiah seems to hint at spiritual as well as bodily destitution among the "carried away" of Naphtali, the "people in the shadow of death."

John Hyrcanus had his son Alexander Jannæus, afterwards king, whose sight he could not brook, brought up in Galilee:

* Non erant inter Galilæos sacerdotes, Lightf. p. 232. There, too, the various customs. The language, Ib. and Matt. xxvi. 73. The pride in the temple is seen everywhere. Cf. the continual pluming themselves upon it in 2 Macc. ii. 22. iii. 2. xii. 30. and vid. 2, 22 : τὸ περιβόητον καθ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην ἱερόν.

† Matt. xxvi. 69, 73; John vii. 52, i. 46, xix. 19; Acts ii. 7.

Antipater thought his younger son, the stripling Herod, man enough to rule that province.*

The country was not so bad after all. By nature, to begin with, it was largely favoured indeed. Within its compass of perhaps 100 square miles, about a third of the Holy Land this side Jordan, not quite a quarter of the whole land of Judæa with its 500 square miles or thereabouts, it contained the most trenchant contrasts.† In the north towards Lebanon in Upper Galilee (Galil Elion), it was rugged, rocky, full of hollows and crevices formed by clefts in its limestone hills; but southward, in Lower Galilee (Galil Tachton) there opened out a lovely fertile tract of Alpine country with hills and dales and large table lands, which, to the south-east, on the shore of the glorious lake of Gennesaret, the neighbourhood of which is now and again designated by the name of the Vale-Country as a third division of Galilee, issued forth in that incomparable Garden of God, which the opening of Jesus' ministry will bring before us. The most splendid pastures alternated with the most fertile fields and the most luxuriant woods, where, along with the more hardy walnut tree, the sanguine palm, the olive, and the fig, friends of milder breezes, could flourish side by side. No stranger to the scorching south wind, which dried up the abundant brooks, and killed the freshness of its verdure; nor yet to the earthquake's shock transmitted from the lake's volcanic stone, from which however streamed warm precious springs (the Baths of Tiberias and Emmaus)—take it all in all it was a land that would tempt to industry the most dispirited of husbandmen. Accordingly, it was very thoroughly cultivated, better than it is to-day: not a spot of it lay waste, and a dense population was settled everywhere. The largest towns were—in the south, Sepphoris in the most fertile mountain district, and Tiberias on the lake; to the north, Zebulon and

* Isa. viii. 23, ix. 1. Cf. Gesenius, 350 ff. Alex. Jannæus, Jos. Ant. 13, 12, 1. Herod. 14, 9, 2.

† Cf. Grätz, 3, 359 ff. Arnold Paläst, Art. in Herzog XI., 2 ff.

Gabara. But even Scythopolis gave shelter to from 30,000 to 40,000 inhabitants; and the mere village populations, if we may trust the scarcely credible statement of Josephus, exceeded as a rule the number of 15,000. At the time of the Jewish war the towns and villages were counted at no less than 204, from which we should have to infer a gross population of from two to three millions, and at any rate, may reckon two millions, especially when confronted by Josephus' mention of 100,000 Galilæan warriors.*

Side by side with agriculture, the ordinary occupation of the people, there was a flourishing trade in the produce of the country, especially in corn and oil, which were conveyed to Phœnicia and Syria from Capernaum, Chorazin, Sepphoris, and Giscala, by means of roads of which the most famous, the "Sea Road," ran from Ptolemais (Akko) by way of Sepphoris, Nazara, Tiberias, Capernaum, in the direction of Damascus. In these circumstances great wealth was amassed, exemplified in the great ease with which Herod, as ruler of Galilee, was enabled to raise a contribution for Rome of 100 talents, more speedily than was possible anywhere in Judæa; but still more strikingly in the splendour of the larger towns, and in the easy luxurious life of corrupt enjoyment, for which the Galilæans were rebuked by the mouth of the Lord.

An agricultural population will draw from the soil not only its wealth but its character as well: simple as surrounding nature, joyous as the sky above its head, healthy, vigorous, and

* See the description Jos. B. J. 3, 3, 2. 3, 10, 8. 3, 3, 2. *τηλικαῦται τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τοσοῦτοις ἔθνεσιν ἀλλοφύλοις [κε] κυκλωμένοι.*—*Μέρος αὐτῆς οὐδὲν ἀργόν,* &c. 'H *ἀνω, κάτω* B. J. 3, 3, 1; *לְעִירָא* and *לְעִירָא* Mishn. Sheb. 9, 2 in Winer, Galilæa. Towns and Villages B. J. 3, 3, 2. Number Vit. 45. Cf. Grätz 3, 360 (3 Mill. 60,000 to the square mile). In that case there would not be much difference between Pal. and Egypt with its 7½ Mill. B. J. 2, 16, 4. Size of villages in part strongly fortified, also Vit. 45. Tac. H. 5, 7. Sepphoris Vit. 9. 25. 65, and see B. J. 3, 2, 4. Cf. Lightf. p. 229 f. Tiberias Vit. 25. Ant. 18, 2, 3, and see Zebulun B. J. 2, 18, 9. Gabara Vit. 25. Scythopolis B. J. 2, 18, 3. Vit. 6. Asochis more than 10,000 Ant. 13, 12, 4. With ease Josephus musters 100,000 men B. J. 2, 20, 6. Vit. 19.

high souled. Such are the traits which we discover in the Galilæans, exemplified in their attachment both to their ruler Herod, and afterwards to Josephus, the Pharisaean commander on the Galilæan theatre of war, under the Emperor Vespasian.* Josephus extols the more than ordinary goodwill and confidence which the Galilæans bestowed on him. Although their cities were destroyed in war, their women and children dragged away into captivity, their lamentations over their own misfortunes were as nothing to their anxiety for the life and welfare of Josephus.† This magnanimity was apparent likewise in their warlike valour. While the Jewish nation as a whole was brave and warlike to the point of scoffing at danger, this was pre-eminently true of the men of Galilee.‡

The very heathendom with which they were encircled was the means of training them into heroes, who were ready to stake their lives in defence of their own independence and the integrity of their frontier. Inured from childhood to the love of battle, the men of the country knew no cowardice, presenting a determined front to every invader; indeed their inborn bravery backed by the alliance of a singularly advantageous position with its natural fortresses of Sepphoris, Arbela near Magdala, Safed, Giscala, Jotapata, and many others, was wont in all ages to assume the aberrant form of that daring brigandage of which the tremendous figures of an Ezekias and a Judas in the days of Herod are embodiments.

* Agriculture B. J. 3, 3, 2. Ant. 18, 8, 6. Especially Giscala (the Land of Fatness—Gnsh-chaleb) famed for its oil ("the foot is dipped in oil"), Capernaum, Chorazin, Sepphoris famed for grain and fruit. Grätz 3, 360. Trade B. J. 2, 21, 2. Act. xii. 20. via Maris already in Isa. viii. 23. Cf. Art. Strassen in Palästina by Arnold in Herzog. Wealth Ant. 14, 15, 4. B. J. 3, 3, 2. The Contribution B. J. 1, 11, 2. Ant. 14, 11, 2. Jesus' judgment, Matt. xi. 7-8, 16-24.

† Herod Ant. 15, 15, 1. Josephus Vit. 16. *τοσαύτη δ' ἦν πρὸς με τοῦ πλῆθους τῶν Γαλιλαίων ἐννοια καὶ πίστις, ὥστε . . .*

‡ With regard to the Jews in general, cf. Phil. Leg. p. 1023. Above Vol. I. Note. Cf. p. 229, the three leaders in war (among whom was John the Essene), B. J. 3, 2, 1: *ἀλκίην τε κορυφαῖοι καὶ σύνεσιν*. Tac. H. 5, 6: *corpora hominum salubria et ferentia laborum*.

The line of the frontier, the mountains and the plains, and the fertility of the land, often fixed this district as the field of battle, especially with the northern foe, viz. the plain of Jezreel, the lakes of Gennesaret and Merom, Mount Tabor, Sepphoris, and the fortress of Arbela. But the Galilæans themselves joined valiantly in the fray. In the time of the Judges ten thousand men full of the scorn of death, from Issachar, Zebulon and Naphtali under Deborah and Barak smote the king of Hazor beginning at Mount Tabor : Zebulon, Naphtali and Asher followed Gideon in his onslaught on Midian ; in the ninth century, when the kingdom was already divided, the princes of Zebulon and Naphtali (whose exploits are celebrated, as Hitzig shows, in the 68th Psalm) led their warriors against Moab, in league with the ensigns of Benjamin and Juda.* After the close of the Maccabæan wars until the Roman era, continual feuds were kept up with the valiant Samaritans, through whose territory the Galilæans often forced a passage in order to attend the sacred feasts at Jerusalem. Aristobulus II. and Herod the Great found them excellent soldiers, and in the Roman war Josephus easily raised 100,000 patriots ready to die, for all flocked to him of their own free will with weapons in their hands.†

On this occasion too, as formerly in the struggles with Syria and Samaria, their distinctly Jewish patriotism was manifest. By no means did they deserve the contempt which they suffered at the hands of Judæa, a contempt which has transmitted

* Bravery of the Galilæans B. J. 3, 3, 2; *τοσοῦτοις ἔθνεσιν ἀλλοφύλοις κυκλωμένοι πρὸς πᾶσαν αἰὲν πολέμου πείραν ἀντίσχεον, μάχιμοί τε γὰρ ἐκ νηπίων . . .* The strong points of Galilee, Jos. Vit. 37. Less known conflicts in Galilee, e.g. Jos. Ant. 12, 8, 2 (Simon Macc. victorious as far as Ptolemais); 12, 11, 1 (Bacchides takes Arbela on the Lake of Gennesaret); 13, 5, 7 (Jonathan conquers near Hazor); 13, 6, 1 (Jonathan with 40,000 men at Scythopolis); 13, 12, 4 f. (Jannæus near Sepphoris); 14, 7, 3 (Alexander Son of Aristobulus II. fights at Tabor against Gabinius).—Robbers : Ant. 14, 9, 2. 14, 15, 4-5. 17, 10, 3. B. J. 2, 4. Barak : Judges iv.-v. Scorn of death v. 18. Gideon vi. 35 ; vii. 23. Ps. 68 in Hitzig, Psalmen (1866).

† Conflicts with Samaria, Ant. 20, 6, 1, cf. B. J. 2, 3, 4. The army of Josephus B. J. 2, 20, 6. Vit. 19. Aristobulus, Ant. 13, 6, 5.

itself to the latest Jewish historians, whose representations of the rude and boorish awkwardness of the Galilæans are however to some extent an artificial coinage at the expense of Jesus.* Their distance from the capital and their friction with heathendom only served to intensify their attachment to the national idea to the pitch of a fervid passion. They diligently resorted to the Feast at Jerusalem as the history of the Herodæans amply recounts, but even in their own country they had not only synagogues but Scribes in abundance, now active at home, like the well known Judas of Galilee, now going as missionaries abroad, as the Galilæan Eleazar who a few years after the time of the ministry of Jesus went to Adiabene, while visits of Scribes and Pharisees from Juda and Jerusalem were never wanting; they were held in high esteem by the people and in the synagogues, where they had the seats of honour; and enjoyed such signal notoriety, that a few vigorous touches in the sermons of Jesus were all-sufficient to reproduce in men's minds their entire image along with the name.†

Joined to the pride of freedom natural to Galilæans, which even in the persons of the "Robbers" showed itself magnanimous enough in its resistance to Herod the Great, the devotion of Galilee to its national institutions became a formidable weapon in the hands of those Scribes who were wont to preach the freedom of the people of God from the yoke of the alien. In the Pentecostal revolt from Archelaus and the Romans which took place after the death of Herod the Great, it was the Galilæans who were most prominently concerned of all.

In their own country, where Judas, the son of the terrible Ezekias whom Herod the King had slain, aspiring to the throne, had armed the people from Herod's arsenals in Sephoris, they were only subdued after bloody war, the destruc-

* Cf. Grätz. 3, 361 : and immediately afterwards p. 362 : the home of Judas founder of the Zealots, and of Jesus of Nazareth. Similarly Geiger and Renan, see my *Gesch. Christus*, p. 74.

† Eleazar : *Ant.* 20, 2, 4. The copious presence of scribes in Galilee we see from *Matt.* v-vii. ix. 1 ff. 11 ff. 34. xii. 1 ff. xv. 1 ff. and elsewhere.

tion of the capital Sepphoris and the selling of the inhabitants into slavery, by Varus, governor of Syria.* Ten years later, Judas of Galilee took the field with the cry of Freedom in opposition to the taxation which did not touch Galilee at all, and in the mouth of his sons that cry continued to resound under the reign of the Emperors until the final war, in which Galilee was the first great arena of the bloodiest struggles, and from the scene of its ruin furnished the Jerusalemites with the terrible John of Giscala as their leader to disaster.† But with all this we must not undervalue the influences of the mingling of nations in these districts. The mere change and interchange of blood will not have been without effect in contributing to the greater mobility and sanguine vivacity of the national temperament in Galilee, a temperament which discovers itself in the sudden and frequent flaring up of patriotic hopes which distinguishes this race, as well as in the psychological criticism of his countrymen which Jesus supplies, or again, in the typical Galilæan, the favourite disciple Peter.‡ But the culture and customs of the surrounding heathen had also their effect, the more so that the leaden weight of Jerusalemic ordinances exercised after all less of pressure, and established less of uniformity here than in the south. The west was the seat of Phœnician, the north of Syrian, the east—indeed, the capital of the country Tiberias, the residence of Antipas—that of Græco-Roman culture. Even Greek men of letters were here to be found.

That the attitude of the Galilæans was not simply one of

* Ant. 17, 10, 1 ff, B. J. 2, 3. Destruction of Sepphoris, Ant. 17, 10, 9. "Freedom," the watchword even of the robbers, who would rather die than surrender. Ant. 14, 15, 5. With regard to Ezekias and Judas cf. B. J. 1. 10, 5. Ant. 14, 9, 2. 17, 10, 5. Cf. Arbela 12, 11, 1. 14, 15, 4. B. J. 1, 10, 2. Vita 37, 60. On the confusion of Judas with J. Galilæus, see Vol. I. p. 256 Note.

† Cf. B. J. 2, 21. 4, 2, 4. 6, 9, 4. Strictly speaking, Judas was a Gaulonite; but he must surely have been active in the west also, inasmuch as he is called a Galilæan.

‡ See especially Matt. xi. 7: *κάλαμος ὑπ' ἀνέμου σαλευόμενος*, xi. 16: *παιδία ἐν ἀγοραῖς*.

aversion is proved by Alexander Jannæus of Galilee, who of all the Hasmonæans was most Hellenistically emancipated from the religion of his fathers; and afterwards by the Jewish scholar Justus, the son of Pistus in Tiberias, a man imbued with Hellenic culture, and author of a Jewish history reaching to the time of Agrippa II. In Tiberias generally the Græco-Roman type predominated. Here Antipas incurred no odium on account of the heathen ornamentation of his palace, and his construction of an amphitheatre, and when Josephus appeared in Galilee with the decree of the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem for the demolition of that long detested abomination, the palace of Herod, he met with stout opposition from the Council and the first citizens of Tiberias, with Julius Capellus at their head, although the chief of the party of "the fishermen and the poor" Jesu-ben-Sapphia even anticipated him by a fanatical burning of the palace.* Besides this, we have the remarkable fact, that the Galilæans, in the spring of 37, were plainly not displeased by the passage of the Roman army with its ensigns through their territory when it went to the succour of Antipas, while the men of Jerusalem laid a protest before Vitellius against its further progress.† That Galilee was not so straitlaced in the matter of tradition and ordinances as the rest of Palestine has doubtless a connexion with these facts also. The later Scribes were not only wont to aver, "there was no priest among the Galilæans;" but also, "they do not learn the law from One Master," like the Judaism which was faithful to tradition.

The solemn form of swearing by imprecating the curse of the "priests" was unknown to them, and the oath sworn by the "sacrifice" was for them no binding vow.

Rest and motion, impassability and susceptibility, brooding gravity and open-hearted gaiety could not better have supple-

* Justus Vit. 9. Here also mention is made of other men of mark. Palace of Antipas, Vit. 12.

† Jos. Ant. 18, 5, 3.

mented each other than in the mutual interaction of Galilee and Jerusalem.*

There certainly were not wanting serious drawbacks to the Galilæan character and life. Much bodily and spiritual misery appears in Jesus' own time, much physical degeneracy, amounting in some cases to that strange derangement of the mental functions, which was explained as demoniacal possession. Side by side with wild outbursts of energy is found that enervation which is the fruit as well of sensual enjoyment as of depressing penury; along with mental activity is united that idle hankering after novelty, which even Josephus finds fault with, the rapid wearing away of the deepest and most solemn impressions, and the intractable humour, which no one was able to satisfy.† Thus metal and dross lay close together in the character of the people; a store of geniality and fresh gushing vivacity of mind along with a lack of serious persistence, whether in thought, in sentiment, or in action.

No one had more experience of this than Jesus, although even in the faults of his Galilæans he always discerned rather the weaknesses of the child than the offences of the criminal. He too supplied one side of that experience as an exemplar of the noblest virtues native to his land. But how many an eminent personality for good or for evil did that country produce? We are mostly far too negligent in counting up the great names of Galilee, as though we were still concerned to justify the haughty Jerusalem's contemptuous ban. Galilee of the Gentiles furnished Israel in the time of the Judges with Barak, the conqueror of the Canaanites; the judge Elon from Zebulun; later, a mass of prophets, whose remembrance never died out from tradition, and to whom posterity built sepulchres. Although Thisbe, the home of the illustrious

* Galilæi non discunt ab nno magistro, Lightf. 232. Manners and Customs, Ib.

† Matt. xi. 7 ff. 16 ff. Then cf. along with the constant vacillations and factions in the Jewish war the sentence of Josephus about the dwellers in Tiberias, Vit. 17, νεωτέρων ἐπιθυμοῦντες ἀεὶ πραγμάτων καὶ φύσει πρὸς μεταβολὰς ἐπιτηδείως ἔχοντες καὶ στάσει χαίροντες.

Elija, was scarcely the Galilæan Thisbe, yet the path of that prophet to Carmel, where according to the Rabbis he still continued to dwell not exactly spell bound, but rather in the enjoyment of Sabbatic calm, lay through this land, and his scholar Elisha was not only on terms of hospitality with Shunem in Issachar, but the territory of this tribe was his home.* Of the later prophets Hosea from Issachar; Jona the son of Amittai, from the neighbourhood of Sepphoris in Zebulon, Nahum from Elkosh—belong to Galilee. In the Assyrian captivity appears the name of Tobit of Naphtali. Aristobulus the first Jewish philosopher of note in Alexandria, the Peripatetic and forerunner of Philo, is said to have been born in Paneas. The famous scribe Nithai of Arbela under John Hyrcanus the Maccabæan; and indeed the son of the latter himself, King Alexander Jannæus, calls Galilee his native land. About the time of Jesus the prophetess Anna, of Asher, is reputed to have flourished, and his historical contemporary is the Zealot Judas Galilæus from the east shore of the lake, along with a train of sons and daughters worthy of equal rank,—and somewhat later the missionary doctor of the Law, Eleazar. According to a statement of Jerome the parents of the great Apostle Paul came from Giscala in Naphtali.

The commencement of the Jewish war gives us the distinguished names of Julius Capellus with his adherents; two Herods, Compsus and Crispus; yet again Pistos and his son Justus the learned philhellene; finally John of Giscala, the mighty warrior chief, beholds the end of Jerusalem, and finishes his life in Romish captivity: were we to come down still further, how many learned Scribes, both newly settled and indigenous, in how many a town or village, should we have to count, who from the remains of their great men, a Shemaiah, an Abtalion, a Shammai and a Hillel in Tiberias and Safed, restored for centuries the fame of Rabbinism, and have per-

* Elijah on Carmel *sabbatizans*. Lightf. 339. Thisbe in Galilee, Tob. i. 2. In Gilead, 1 Kings xvii. 1 ff. Ant. 8, 13, 2.

petuated it to this day in the Talmudic collection ; still waiting till the Messiah should emerge from the ripples of that lake, over which he had long passed away.*

2.—THE COUNTRY TOWN.

Among the localities of Galilee, Nazara occupied but a modest place. Josephus as well as the entire Old Testament is silent about Nazara, although he leaves us free to look even here for a population of 10,000 at the least. After all it was to its greatest citizen that it owed its whole celebrity, whom notwithstanding together with his infant Church the Jewish and heathen world derided when they would deny his greatness,—not only as “the Galilæan,” but also as “the Nazarene.” “Can any good thing come out of Nazara?” The Emperor Julian still spoke in his day of Nazarenes; Eusebius and Jerome notice with what difficulty the Church got rid of the nickname and vindicated for itself the Christian title. Even the Talmudists call the Lord Hannozeri or Ben Nezar; the Arabs the Christians En-Nusara to this day.†

It is not from any passion for innovation, but out of defer-

* Barak: Judges iv. 6 ff. Elon: Judges xii. 11 ff. Elisha from Abel-Mecholah in Issachar 1 Kings xix. 16 cf. Judges vii. 22. Hosea is said to come from Belemoth in Issachar: Pseudo-Epiph. 11. Jonah the son of Amittai: Kings xiv. 25. Nahum of Elkosh (Nah. i. 1), which Jerome on Nah. i. 1 finds as a *viculus* in Galilee. Tobit, see the Book of Tobit, i. 1. Aristobulus in Eus. 7, 32. The reading vacillates (*ὁ πάνυ*); but MSS. and Rufinus have Paneas. Cf. also Herzfeld 3, 473. Alex. Jannæus Ant. 13, 12, 1. Anna: Luke ii. 36. Eleazar: Ant. 20, 2, 4. Paul: Jerome, Vir. Ill. 5: oppido Judææ Gischalis quo a Romanis (War of Varus? or Taxing?) capto cum parent. v. Tarsum Ciliciæ commigravit. This it is true goes against Acts xxii. 3, 28; but the parents may have emigrated before his birth 750 or 760 A.D. Judas Galilæus and sons Vol. I. p. 256 f. Related to Judas Galilæus was a highly cultured woman, B. J. 9, 1. Of Justus, Capellus, John of Giscala we spoke above.

† John i. 46; xix. 19. Acts xxviii. 22: *αἰρεσις Ναζωραίων (ἀντιλεγόμενη πανταχοῦ)*. Also iii. 6; xxiv. 5. Besides cf. Sepp. loc. cit. II. 74. Renan p. 25 f.; who also gives more than about 3000.

ence to our earliest sources and the indications they afford, as well as in the second place for the sake of euphony, that we call the homo of Jesus Nazara.*

How many forms does the word assume in the New Testament alone, and how many interpretations of that name so pregnant with blessed foreboding meet us in later times! The first Evangelist, to go no further, seeks for Jesus the "Nazorite" in the Prophets with all the artifice he can muster: but even the question, which passage in the Prophets he has in view might kindle a lively contest. It has been usual to derive, with them of old time, both the name of the

* The New Testament has mostly *Naẓapēr*, *Naẓapār* (also *ῥ*, *δ*) cf. Ir. 3, 12, 7. Tert. Marc. 4, 8. The second form is probably more primitive and agrees with Hitzig's kind and valuable communication (Cf. Theol. J. 1842, 410), according to which the word originally sounded נָצְרֶת, נָצְרָת, נָצְרָת; Arab. Partic. ben. = the Protectress. Nizrath among the Rabbis, Herzfeld 3, 195, is uncertain. But now in the oldest documents, the settlers of disputes in the present day, the form *Náẓapa* or *Naẓapā* comes more and more to the front: Jul. Afr. in Pal. init. 3. sec. ap. Eus. H. E. 1, 7: ἀπὸ Ναζάπων καὶ Κωχαβὰ, where the Hebrew integrity is especially certain in the second word: then Orig., Cod. Sin. Vat.; Fragn. Luc. Treg., Z. Itala in Matt. ii. 23 (k: Nazarein). 4, 13 (Orig. Sin. Vat., Z. k.) Luke iv. 16 (Sin. Fragn. Luc. Treg. al.), John i., 46 (e). Tischendorf took it into the text in his (only begun) 8th. krit. A. Matt. iv. 13 (τῇν Ναζαρά), in Syn. 2. A. also in Luke v. 16. Cf. Delitzsch, Jesus u. Hillel, p. 13. This form alone is suited by the nom. gent. *Ναζωραῖος* (*Naẓop.* especially Sin. in Act.) in Matt. John, Acts, and *Ναζαρηνός* (cf. *Μαγδαληνή* fr. Magdala) in Mark, Luke: *Nazare(w)us* It. Tert. Jer. Vulg. not to speak of the Talmudic *Hannozeri*, and the modern Arabic *Nāsira* (Burckh. Naszera). Bleek also, Synopsis I. 128, looking to the nom. gent. regards the *t* in Nazaret as merely servile. If we consider it as even so much as a fem. ending, it seems to me that we cannot satisfactorily explain its falling away either in Nazara or in the nom. gent. Cf. with the first *Σάρεφθα* (still Sarfend) *Δαβιρῶθ* (Sept), *Δαβάριρα* (Jos.) in Eus. first *Δάβειρα* (Sept. also *Δίββα*, *Δεβίρ*), Cf. also from *נְצֻרָת* *Βασιμμάθη* Jos. *Βασεμάθ* Sept. With the second Ephrati, Chamati, Gitti, Maakati, Schimati cf. Pelishti, Antoti: Greek *Ἐφραθαῖος*, *Χαμαθὶ* &c. *Σαριφαῖος*, Ant. 17, 6, 2 does not = *Σαραφθαῖος*, but = Sherebiah, *Σαραβίας*. In Arabic it is true the ending *at* falls off in the nom. gent.; in Hebrew only now and again the ending *ah* (constr. *at*) e.g. *Jehudi*, *Timni*, *Berji*: the common form is here too *Arbati*, *Gassati*, *Suchati*, *Naamati*, *Ramati*. Side by side *Zorati* and *Zori*. Thus from Nazaret, as well as *Nazerat*, *N-raïos* were rather to be looked for. But from Nazara with the Aram. Art. arose *Nazarata*, shortened *Nazarat* (h), like *Ramatha*, *Rablatha*, *Rabatha* from *Ramāh*, *Riblah*, *Rabbah*; or *Sata*, Greek *σάρον*, from *Seah*. Cf. however Hitzig loc. cit. Ewald Ausf. Lehrb. 7. A. 1863, p. 426. Olshausen, Lehrb. 1861, 414 f.

Town and the title of the Nazorite from the mystic "Nezar" of the Old Testament, the messianic "Branch" of the house of David: in a poetical moment Jerome by dint of the same word came upon the thought of the "Flower of Galilee." With more sobriety the traveller Burckhardt thought of the "bushy undergrowth" in the neighbourhood of Nazara. Etymologically it may be possible to connect Nazara with Nezar: though scarcely Nazaret, to say nothing of "Nazorite:" in point of fact the attempt to do so is most likely a mere mysticizing artifice.*

The name of the town means in all probability the "Protectress," whether we look for the original form in Nozerah, or in Nazerat, and whether with Hitzig who proposes the second, we think of some Goddess swift to succour in Canaanitish times, or whether as I should prefer, of the lofty situation of the town in its narrow valley, where its airily exalted neighbours on the top and sides of the hills, Sepphoris (from Zippori, Bird), Safed (from Zephath, Watch), and Magdala (from Migdal, Tower), owe their names to a similar circumstance.† Whether the town was as Sepp observes, formerly called the "White Town on the Hill," and whether accordingly Nazara originally

* Nezar, Isa. xi. 1 (quoted Matt. ii. 23) is already in the thoughts of the eruditi Hebræorum of Jerome ad h. l. (cf. ben nezer Lightf. 578) and many moderns down to Hengstenberg, Winer, Bleek. Linguistically Segol and Tsere seem capable of passing into A, cf. Βηθσαμὴν (Beth-shemesh) Κάδης, Κίδασα (Kedesh) Γάδαρα (Geder) Ρακά (Reka); reasons against: above. Flos Galilææ, Jerome Ep. ad. Marc. 46. Bushy growth, Burckh. 2, 583. Favourite explanations of Ναζωρ. as Nazarite since Eus. Jer. Other explanations cf. Bleek 1, 129. Hitzig's excellent remarks on Ναζωρ. (Isa. xlix. 6). Theol. Lehrbb. 1842, 410 ff. Cf. 2nd. Div. § 2.

† Hitzig and Schrader; Protectress: more particularly Hitzig: נָצִירָה is the goddess of succour (the goddess of fortune=נָצִירָה in Ascalon cf. נָצִירָה. I should call to mind נָצִירָה (Nozerah), the protectress, cf. מִגְדַּל גִּבְרָה 2 Kings xvii. 9: less should I think of נָצִירָה cf. Jer. i. 8=the protected one, both names due to the situation. I think that thus (as Jehudi from Jehudah) נָצִירָה explains itself, and what is of more moment Ναζωπαῖος. For the so frequently occurring N. gent. Ναζ. (also in Celsus 7, 18) is not only vouched for by Matt. or the prophet. Of the dull vowels of the north, the south probably made a clean sweep. Cf. Bleek. 128.

was named "the white shining one," we will leave undecided.* In the time of Jesus Nazara is called a town, it has its synagogue, is situate on a hill with steep descent, and communicates with Capernaum and Cana. Later on, Julius Africanus, Eusebius and Jerome, even Epiphanius discover it again as a little village not far from Mount Tabor.† There can be no doubt that the later and modern Nazara (Nasira with its 3000 inhabitants, of whom a third are Christian, the rest Mahomedan), lies upon the site of the old: even the ancient fragmentary descriptions agree with the supposition.‡ Nazara lies on the S.W. of what was once the tribe of Zebulon, to which also the large towns which threw it into the shade, Sepphoris and Taricheæ, though hardly Tiberias, belonged.§ It lies hid among the mountains and is shut in on all sides by hills of unequal height. Here a narrow hollow longer than it is broad, perhaps a mile in length and half a mile in breadth extends to the S.E. until it issues in a close and crooked valley reaching to the great plain of Jezreel.

The little town lies upon the lower part of the slope of the north-western hill which rises steep and rocky to a height of 500 feet according to Robinson's estimate, at any rate to more than 300 above the level of the plain of Jezreel.

In other directions the hills are not so high. The impression made by a town encamped as it were in terraces in and above the cauldron-shaped hollow of the valley is very pleasing.

* Sepp. II. 73 ff. Bethlaban; Ir lebanah behar. We should have to think of the houses and rocks of limestone.

† *πόλις* Matt. ii. 23, Luke iv. 29, *ὄρος ἐφ' ᾧ ἡ πόλις* Luke iv. 29. Synagogue, Matt. xiii. 54; Luke iv. 16. Capernaum, Luke iv. 31; Matt. iv. 13. Cana, John ii. 1, iv. 46. *κώμη*, Jul. Afric. Eus. 1, 7. Eus. onom.: viculus in Galilæa, Sepp. p. 75. According to Epiph. Hær. 1, 11. Tiberias, Sepph. Naz. Capern. were still long inhabited by Jews. Robinson, iii. 519.

‡ On the Nazara of to-day Burckhardt, *Reisen in Syrien &c.* ii. 583 ff. Robinson, *Palästina* iii. 418 ff. [Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 337, Robinson's *Researches*, iii. 183-200, English editions of these works]. Sepp. *Jerus.* ii., 72 ff. Renan, p. 25 ff. Strauss, *Sinai and Golgotha*, 2 Ed. 1848, p. 400 ff. K. Furrer *Wand. durch Pal. Zürich*, 1865, p. 267 ff.

§ Cf. the boundaries of the north. tribes, Joshua xix. Jos. Ant. 5, 1, 22. Also Pt. III. § 3. ch. ii. note at the end.

The white shining houses are well built of stone, with flat roofs; the most massive building is the Latin monastery, the most loftily conspicuous the mosque, surrounded by cypresses, and surmounted by a minaret that overlooks the town. By the ancient gate of the town stands the square-built synagogue, now in the hands of the Greeks, perhaps the same one in which Jesus taught. The most certainly genuine antiquity is in any case "The Virgin's Well," its vaulted sides always surrounded by drawers of water by which once Mary with her daughters stood. The Grotto of the Annunciation is shown by both Latins and Greeks in their churches, nor is the workshop of Joseph wanting, in which the Son too tried his hand. Still less by far the changes which Nature will have undergone. The houses are overshadowed by the dark green of the cypress, cactus-hedges fence in the gardens, fine plantations of trees are interspersed with fertile fields; palms, figtrees, olives may be seen, as well as the vine; and in olden times the fruit of the White Town's vineyards was the favourite Temple-wine.*

As late as the 6th century Antoninus Martyr praises the district as a paradise. The climate is healthy, and in winter cold. The point of chief attraction is the eminence of the north-western hill with its broad and stately dome of rocks on which now stands the gravestone of a Mahomedan saint, Wely Ismail. If the traveller coming up from the south out of the plain of Jezreel across the broad bleak mountain ridges, is surprised by a lovely oasis when he suddenly beholds beneath him the green tranquillity of Nazara's dale,—it is as if the gates of the world were opened on his view when he has climbed above that dreamy solitude to the summit of the rocky hill sparsely covered with grass and thorny undergrowth. For every one who has ever accomplished that ascent the charm is resistless. There is Galilee indeed! On the north, first of all, the green plain El Battauf, quite close upon its southern edge

* Sepp. p. 73.

Sepphoris with its fortress-hill; on the northern edge Cana Galil, next, the hill tops of Upper Galilee mounting one above the other; especially distinct are the hills of Safed; in the extreme background, high above all, Hermon's everlasting snow mingling in virgin purity with the azure of the skies. In the east, at a distance of five miles, the noble smoothly rounded cone of Tabor, thickly overgrown with oaks and pistachios; further on, the hills of Lake Gennesaret, and beyond its eastern shore the mountain chains of Gilead.

Southward, the plain of Jezreel, of fertile soil and fertilized by blood, with its towns and villages; bounded towards the east by the Little Hermon, and mountains of Gilboa; on the south-west by the circle of the Samaritan hills, whose modest wooded elevations stretch out the hand to Carmel. By far the most glorious object in the west is the massive mountain of the prophet, with its monastery of Elijah—Carmel—forest crowned with oaks and pines; beneath, cornfields, laurel and olive groves—while the mountain's foot dips boldly into the Mediterranean Sea, which northward and southward from Gaba (Haifa), Herod's cavalry station, to Ptolemais, spreads out the pensive azure of its sparkling flood. There was a watch tower in God's great world! where a man might not only enlarge the narrower horizon of his vision, or to speak with Renan, "dream the dream of boundless bliss," but also by dint of visible landmarks which stretched beyond the limits of his immediate home across the entire Holy Land, into the borders of the heathen, and over the ocean's endless mirror as far as the ends of the earth—read the riddle of his inner destiny.*

In a spot like Nazareth it is impossible to imagine a people spiritually destitute, if Nature has a word to say in the development of man.

What though the place for seductive charm and spacious breadth of sweep was behind the Lake of Gennesaret, yet

* Renan, p. 26. Cf. Furrer, p. 267 ff.

where else sooner than in the dreamy stillness of this hallowed ground would one look for the benevolent kind-hearted Galilæans of Josephus? This retirement of theirs was well fitted to produce contemplative children of natural and spiritual birth, while on the other hand the whole situation forbade one-sidedness. Not only from the hill-top downwards was the extent of Nazara's world. The large and wealthy Sepphoris, the head of Galilee, both town and fortress, was scarcely three hours' distant; Tiberias, eight; all round a wreath of village populations. One of the world's highways led from Ptolemais through Nazara to Damascus.

Northwards the road runs to Sepphoris and Ptolemais, northeastwards are two ways to Tiberias, and eastwards one to Tabor, southward is the outlet upon the plain of Jezreel.* Here, too, the nations crossed each other's paths: lying, as it did, between Carmel and Tabor, to whose alluring summit Jesus, according to ancient testimony, once ascended, Nazara had on one side Phœnicians, on another Syrians and Arabians in its immediate vicinity. The large and neighbouring Sepphoris was of altogether a motley character, had relations with Phœnicia, and remained in the last war from the beginning on the side of Rome against "the Jews."† Though some have adduced the unbelief of the Nazarenes in the greatest Son of Man as a proof of the narrowest civilianism, he himself judged far more mildly when he spoke of every prophet as despised in his own town. While some again have taken the word of Nathanael concerning Galilee as a place where no good thing could grow, as actually alluding to the immorality of the town; this is but a fancy unsupported by fact, and refuted by the absence of rebuke in the gentle atti-

* Robinson, p. 420 [185 Eng. Ed.]

† Ant. 13, 15, 4 (Carmel and Tabor), 13, 1, 4. cf. 13, 9, 1 (Gabatha). Sepphoris^s cf. 14, 15, 3 (Gabinus); Vit. 8 (war); 22 (Ptolemais); 65 (against the Jews; 67 (δόφυλοι). Jesus on Tabor: ἀπήνεγκέ με ἡ μήτηρ (τὸ πνεῦμα) εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα Θαβώρ (truly a journey through the air. Vol. I. p. 48.) Gosp. of the Hebrews in Orig. on John. Cf. Jerome on Mic. vii. 6. De Wette, Einl. p. 98, 101.

tude assumed by Jesus towards it.* The expression implies nothing more than the impossibility of the Messiah coming from the obscure little town among the mountains. To these false inferences we will beware of opposing others equally one-sided, by appealing to the attention and admiration with which Nazara listened to Jesus. But as far as one has any right to elucidate the past by the present, and as far as one may venture to believe in a transmission of Nazarene blood through centuries of national changes, we may appeal to the fact, that, to begin with, Antoninus Martyr admired the kindness, yes, and the beauty of the women of Nazareth, which they themselves gratefully ascribed to the Holy Virgin, and that to this day modern visitors are struck by the peculiar and noble physiognomy of the people, which according to Burckhardt resembles the Egyptian, and distinguishes them from the rest of the Syrians, by the beauty and cleanliness of their dress, and by the courtesy of their behaviour, which still, as in the days of Antoninus, and as in the times of Jesus, betrays a toleration not usual in the East.†

3.—THE PARENTAL HOUSE.

It was a modest house—drawn in detail by Renan, in accordance with the Oriental style of to-day—in which God placed the cradle of his mightiest instrument in the history of the world.‡

But he loves those cradles of the children of the people among whom his ordinances and forces work undisturbed as in nature; and as once he fetched Moses and David and Amos and Elisha from the flocks, so once more in our own era did he call the champion of the spirit of freedom in a miner's cot.

History testifies most strongly to the modest pretensions of the house by its total ignorance concerning it.

* Meyer, Comm. on John i. 47.

† Cf. Burckhardt, p. 583 ff. [337 Eng. Ed.] Sepp. p. 89 f. Renan, p. 27.

‡ Vie de Jésus, p. 22 f. Germ. Ed. by Eichler, 1864, p. 71.

No Greek or Roman annals, no, nor even Hebrew, have rescued so much as its name: and even the New Testament, resounding as it does with the One Name of Salvation, supplies in the Gospels scarce a trace of its origin. The latter show that in the mouth of the people Jesus was regarded as son of the carpenter Joseph and a certain Mary (Mirjam); that the family lived in Galilee, in Nazara; that they were of unsullied name, but of small account, and indeed without possessions; while their only boast, the pedigree which they traced to King David, was put to shame by the low estate to which the house had sunk.* And not even these accounts are clear and consistent. One gives Galilee as the home, the other Judæa; the Davidic descent is derived by different authorities from pedigrees totally divergent; and the question arises at last, whether this descent has after all any credible testimony whatsoever in its favour; inasmuch as it is not even mentioned at all except in the introductory narratives of two Gospels, but for the rest finds no cogent confirmation either in the admissions of the people, or in the utterances of Jesus.

With some approach to certainty we may venture at the outset to fix upon Galilee and Nazara as the abode of Joseph and Mary. The third Gospel designates Nazara with the utmost distinctness as the dwelling place of the parents of Jesus before his birth. Their subsequent residence there has nowhere the appearance of being that of persons who passed among the Nazarenes for strangers or settlers; nor does Jesus seem to be reputed the son of Joseph the foreigner, the Judæan, the Bethlehemite: a mode of treatment natural enough in a little town, and amid conditions of life which apart from that consideration were so immoveably Jewish. Besides Jesus is everywhere called the Galilæan, the Nazarene, and he himself in one scene of the history of unassailable reality, calls Nazara his native town.† It cannot be disputed

* Cf. Matt. xiii. 54 ff. Luke iv. 22, Mark vi. 3.

† Luke i. 26, ii. 4, 39. Native town, Matt. xiii. 57, Luke iv. 24, Mark vi. 4, John iv. 44. The Galilean, Matt. xxvi. 69, Luke xxii. 59, xxiii. 6, John vii. 41,

that these titles suit him better, on the supposition that the parents had always been settled there from the first, than on that of their subsequent immigration from Judæa, perhaps a year or two after his birth.

But what need here of details for making good this position, when we shall find hereafter that in all probability not only did the parents of Jesus, and even to some extent their descendants long after them, live at Nazara, but that Jesus himself was born there ?*

With still greater reliability may we ascertain the relations of Joseph to Mary in Nazara. True we hear flat contradictions concerning the parentage of Joseph : for the first Gospel calls his father Jacob, the third Heli ; while concerning the name of the mother's parents nothing is told us at all.† About her kindred too but very little transpires : only the fourth Gospel tells of a sister of Mary, who herself also bore this favourite name, and as it seems was married to a certain Chalpi (Alphæus, Clopas). With this report one can at best only rest content, if one be allowed to believe in half-sisters, since that full sisters should bear the same name is anything but likely ; since moreover the first and second Gospels mention the second Mary, without giving her any prominence, or indicating in the remotest manner any relationship with the mother of Jesus.‡ The apocryphal Gospel of Matthew finally, has not only made both Marys sisters to each other but even daughters of that

52. Nazarene, Matt. ii. 23, xxi. 11, xxvi. 71, Luke xxiv. 19, John i. 46, xviii. 5, 7, xix. 19, Acts ii. 22, iii. 6. Acc. to Rab. tradtion it is true the process of acclimatization as citizen of a place was quickly accomplished, in from thirty days to a year. Lightf. Horæ, 277.

* The descendants of the family, ἀπό τε Ναζαρέων καὶ Κωχαβὰ (Kaukab between Cæs. Phil. and Damasc.) κωμῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν. Jul. Afric. a. Eus. 1, 7.

† Matt. i. 16 ; Luke iii. 23.

‡ John xix. 25. Cf. Matt. xxvii. 56. Mark xv. 40. Luke xxiv. 10. Clopas father of the second Mary (an interpretation, justifiable in itself, but refuted by the Synopt. loc. cit. and Matt. x. 3. Mark iii. 18, &c., of John xix. 25) Pseud. Matt. 42. According to this passage, it is true, Clopas and Joiakim, Ch. i., again would have then to be identical. Cf. Hofmann, p. 7. As brother to Joseph Clopas appears in Hegesippus ap. Eus. 3, 11. 4, 22.

Clopas, who in the fourth Gospel might be taken for the father of Mary's sister, and is said to have been indemnified for giving up the first Mary the mother of Jesus, to a life of consecration, by the birth of a second Mary.

Of the artificially devised relationships between Mary and the priestess-mother of the Baptist, as related in the third Gospel, or Salome the mother of the sons of Zebedee, we need not here speak.*

Has the far weightier statement of Joseph's Davidic origin, perhaps the very name of Joseph himself, which might remind one of the rabbinical fancies about a "Son of Joseph," a Galilæan Messiah—an equally ideal foundation? Since the last objection is not seriously made and is incidentally discussed in another place, we will keep to the first. On behalf of such a view one might appeal to the fact that the two Gospels of Matthew and Mark, which both in narrative and pedigree speak for the Davidic origin of Joseph and Jesus, are lost in endless self-contradiction, as soon as they attempt to count the names of the pedigree back to David: then again, that neither friends nor foes, above all not even Nazarene fellow-townsmen make any use of the fact of Davidic origin whether by way of recognition or denial, indeed that Jesus himself in express terms rather refuses than affects the title. Finally, in the fourth Gospel the people oppose Jesus, just because according to public estimation he was not sprung from David's seed.

May we not say, in conclusion, that the belief in the Messiahship of Jesus, which soon enough took the shape that prevailing notions dictated, in the acclamation "Son of David," itself assumed the gross form of the material conception, that in the veins of the new Messiah the blood of David flowed.† On these objections is grounded the now quite common

* Luke i. 36. John i. 33. Cf. below John and among Apostles the sons of Zebedee and James son of Alphæus.

† Davidic pedigree, Matt. i. 1-20. Luke i. 27, ff. Luke ii. 4, 11; iii. 23-31. Jesus more than David's son, Matt. xxii. 42 ff. John vii. 41 f. Son of David! a cry of the people, Matt. ix. 27; xii. 23; xv. 22; xx. 32; xxi. 9, 15.

opinion that Jesus was not descended from David.* But they are quite inadequate. The contradictions between the first and second pedigrees may be quietly conceded, without the waste of another word on those torturings of the text by which theological artifice devoid of truth from the times of the Chronologist Julius Africanus, has made out that Matthew and Luke were in perfect harmony.† These writers not only exhibit in their reckoning the formal difference that one of them counts from Abraham forty-two generations of three periods of pregnant significance consisting of fourteen names each, while the other reckons backwards seventy-seven links to Abraham, but they have moreover described from David downwards entirely different lines of descent, the one the kingly line of David and Solomon, the other the non-kingly line of David and Nathan, both with names on the whole totally different, yet from time to time coincident. It would be hard to give the preference to one over the other: suppose we assumed that the pedigree of non-kingly line was the more modest, and at the same time with its obscure names the less easily invented; yet it might be objected on the other hand, that it was just this obscurity of names forming connecting links in an obscure descent, which solved for the Genealogist the difficulty of bridging the gulf between Jesus and David.‡ If however there is now a days nothing for it, but, without preference for one over the other, to leave the two pedigrees standing as they are: that is, simply to recognize their contradictions, and to understand them as attempts of a later time to supply by dint of research and conjecture a pedigree, whose details were wholly obscure, and which was nowhere accurately registered, one already enough neglected in a House which had succumbed to

* Thus lately Renan, Strauss, Schenkel, Schleiermacher. Cf. my *Gesch. Christus*, p. 82.

† Jul. Afr. ap. Eus. 1, 7. *περὶ συμφωνίας τῆς ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγ. γενεαλογίας ἐπιστολῇ* (to Aristides). Most important means of succour: the Levirate marriages. Cf. Winer. A. Jesus.

‡ Isolated correct reminiscences even Herzfeld would not now exclude, I. 385 (in Matt. and Luke). The compilers of the pedigrees, nay their reporters, plainly did not know one another. Luke is more artless and modest.

penury, and after so many national disasters no longer to be restored; yet the existence of a family, nay a popular, tradition of the Davidic origin of the house of Joseph in the abstract, is by no means thus summarily disposed of.* It is only a question of reliable evidence. That there were descendants of David in the time of Jesus, will scarcely be regarded as inconceivable, if only in view of the numerous offspring of the Davidic house. One would rather be inclined to assume that it was so, since in the time of Jesus, and long afterwards, the opinion prevailed that God would raise up the Messiah from the house of David.† Moreover a prominent position is assigned to the race of David in Jerusalem until the day of the philhellene Tobites, and the rise of the Hasmonæans; and it is told of the great Hillel the contemporary of Jesus, that he was descended from David through his wife Abitaal, whom Josephus mentions among the first of David's wives. It is related again of the Emperors Vespasian and Domitian that they made search after the sons of David, and the Babylonian Jews were in the habit of appointing a son of David as, "Head of the Exile."‡ As regards Jesus himself his claim to be not only David's son but his Lord is by no means a denial of Davidic origin, at most a designation of it as the least part of his greatness. On the contrary, it must be said that his intentional appeal to the passage of Scripture is in favour of such descent, and that he could not thus have

* Pedigrees of the Jews, esp. the priestly families, existed even after the catastrophes of the people (Exile, Antiochus, Pompey, Varus) indeed after the last destruction of Jerusalem. They were wont after all this to be restored again continually by the Priests themselves. Jos. c. Ap. 1, 7. The pedigree of Jesus was evidently, as Matt. and Luke show, never so definitely fixed, and the opinion of Jesus' posterity, that king Herod destroyed these and other genealogies (like what is told of him by the Jews also, Jost 1857, 323) is probably only legend. (Jul. Afr. Ens. 1, 7.) The genealogies of this late posterity (ib.), which like Afr. himself only play tricks of artifice with Matt. and Luke, are evidently of no value.

† Cf. Matt. ii. 5 f. 21, 9. Lightfoot p. 257.

‡ Tobites, Vol. I. p. 310. Babel, Vol. I. p. 319. Hillel see Lightf. 256. Abitaal as fifth wife of David, Ant. 7, 1, 4. Herzfeld, 1, 386. Delitsch loc. cit. p. 10. The Roman Emperors, Eus. H. E. III. 12, 19 f.

challenged the answer of the Pharisees, "Messiah is David's son" as he did if he had been no son of David: because he would in that case have only provoked them to incredulity. Quite as little does the fourth Evangelist deny the descent: his silence concerning it in face of the doubts of the people of Jerusalem may be part of his general tone of lofty irony, whether levelled against the people, or material conceptions at large.* Among the people of Galilee we have at least nowhere a denial, not even in Nazara, and the acclamation to the "Son of David," which here and there,—loudest at the entrance into Jerusalem—resounds, is much better explained, if we credit the people with paying any attention to genealogies, on the supposition of his being bodily, and not merely spiritually, his son. Not even the Pharisees are adverse witnesses. When all Jerusalem was echoing with the name of "David," why did they not confound him in the terms of his own question concerning David, with the terse rejoinder "Thou art no son, and therefore no Lord either"? He really cut off all occasion for disputing about this title on a twofold ground: first, because he laid no stress upon it; still more secondly, because no one could take it from him.

But be that as it may, the weightiest evidence for the Davidic origin of Jesus, or at least for the prevalent belief in it, is supplied by the earliest witnesses of Christendom, on the one side the Apostle Paul, on the other the Prophet of the Revelation—John. Paul called him "born of the seed of David according to the flesh." John the Apocalypticist greets him as the "Lion of the tribe of Juda, as the root and offspring of David." To this we may add the statements of some later writings; the sources of the Acts; the Epistle to the Hebrews; later on, the Epistles to Timothy, and once more in the middle of the second century, the Palestinian Hegesippus; in the beginning of the third, Julius Africanus, along with information concerning the posterity of the family of Jesus, which the former adduces as speaking for their Davidic origin, in a

* Cf. along with Matt. xxii. 42 ff. xii. 3, especially too John vii. 41 f.

credible report presented to the Emperor Domitian.* Whoever is at all familiar with the jealous and at the same time suspicious caution of the Jews in respect to pedigrees, whether written or unwritten—a caution abundantly vouched for by Josephus, to whose testimony the very accounts of the destruction of the pedigrees by Herod the Idumæan add further confirmation—must find it conceivable that twenty or thirty years after the time of Jesus his traditional pedigree might somehow or other be known; and on the other hand that it would be impossible to fabricate it as a mere ideal cobweb consistently with the Judæism of the writers and their readers.†

Whoever, moreover, has a due conception of the subtle acumen of a Jew in search for the signs of a Messiah, of the sharp-sightedness of a Pharisee's eye for any taint in the purity of a race, of the critical and intellectual process by which Paul (though he did not thus come by his Christianity) yet defended it, will recognize it as an impossibility that this Apostle to the Gentiles, not only by the way, but with emphasis, yes, with genealogical precision, should have made Jesus "of the seed of David," without any examination, and simply for the reason that he had once for all determined that Jesus was the Messiah, and could not dogmatically think of him otherwise than as David's Son.‡

The fact of, or at least the belief in the Davidic descent, is not then to be so easily let go, however true it is that Jesus neither owed his greatness to that origin, nor rested his greatness upon it. Yet it found him more potent access to the hearts of Israel. Whether his own heart was influenced by the

* Rom. i. 3. Rev. v. 5, xxii. 16. Heb. vii. 14. Acts ii. 29, xiii. 23. 2 Tim. ii. 8. Hegesippus, Eus. H. E. iii. 11, 12. 19, 20.

† Jos. 13, 10, 5. c. Ap. 1, 7. Vit. 1. As to Herod Jul. Af. ap. Eus. 1, 7. Jost 1857, p. 323.

‡ Cf. Lightf. p. 247 and elsewhere. *Israelitæ puræ stirpis, puri sanguinis. Gemar. Bab. non ascendit Ezra e Babylone, usque dum eam puram reddidisset instar farinæ. Gloss.: non reliquit quemvis illic modo quovis illegitimum, sed sacerdotes tantum et Levitas atque Israelitas puræ stirpis.*

fact, who can say? One thing is plain; that interest in the pedigree assumes grander proportions with Luke than with Matthew; for when he calls Jesus a Son of Adam, and through Adam a Son of God, in genuine Pauline style he interweaves his origin with that of all mankind, and with God himself, who created in Adam his first, in Jesus his second and his highest image.*

But let us not lose ourselves in the ultimate author of this new life, until we have accurately explored the domain of its human source. Of the house of David Joseph's family was an insignificant offshoot. Somewhat in the same manner as to this day many an ancient race of noble blood, yes, even old kingly houses, drifting into poverty; houses, of whose obscure stragglers, here England and there France, in fine, Germany itself, still retain some fabulous reminiscences—will depict the earthquake shock of history's vicissitudes "beginning with the first even unto the last," no longer in armorial bearings, no, but in the degenerate forms of its descendants; so must the house of David, whose name is not elsewhere found in the pedigrees of Israel's great ones, have then roamed through the land in lowliest garb, as appears in the case of Hillel. Of grinding penury as afflicting Joseph, it is true, we read nothing; nor find any trace of it in the youth of Jesus, which tells of no hardship and no anxiety; and even the trade of the carpenter was no disgrace in Israel, among whom the scribes were not ashamed to be shoemakers and tentmakers, and (as in Hillel's case) day-labourers. Still, however, he was but on a footing with the other town's folk of Nazara, and scanty means are indicated, not only by the Temple offering in Jerusalem, at least according to the Ebionite sources consulted by Luke, where Joseph and Mary bring the offering of the poorer class, but also by the whole life of Jesus, who calls no spot in the whole world his own, and, according to Luke's source of infor-

* Luke iii. 38. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 45. Rom. v. 12 ff.

mation, supports himself by the gifts of others, without a word being said of his having, like his disciple, or, not to forget Renan's instance, like Sakyamuni, left all that he had, or given it to the poor.*

Later accounts of Hegesippus about the grandsons of Jesus' brother Judas, under Domitian, show us small farmers with unmistakeable marks of coarse manual toil: the two grandsons together possessed thirty-nine acres of land, which they tilled themselves, and which were valued at 9000 denaries or francs.† Of much more importance for us than the Davidic descent, than wealth or poverty, would be the knowledge of the spiritual atmosphere in the midst of which the holy birth took place. But of that there is scarcely a trace. The introductory narrative of Matthew, and still more that of Luke pourtray Joseph and Mary as Israelites observant of the law, and devout believers in Revelation, who once a year journey to Jerusalem for the feast, and punctually fulfil the ordinances of sacrifice and purification. Joseph is just, strict and considerate at once, a faithful guardian of his household circle; Mary, childlike, devout, thoughtful, and reflective; yet so far from weakly sentimental, that she holds the reins of government with an energy that throws Joseph into the shade.‡ Incomparably beautiful as these features are, and reflected, as one might say, humanly perfect in the character of the Son, yet we must not overlook the fact that they are drawn from somewhat late sources, and by recent pens, under the influence of the personality of Jesus, and on the ground of the legends which encompass his youth: and at least one must be eager to see them confirmed by some clearer historical tokens.

There are only two facts which here present themselves. In the first place, no moral taint can have attached to the house. No calumny was ever forged against Jesus from this

* Luke ii. 24. cf. Lev. xii. 8. Matt. viii. 20, cf. xix. 27. Luke viii. 2 f.

† Hegesippus a. Eus. 3, 20.

‡ Matt. i. 18 ff. Luke i. 26 ff. ii. 19. 41-51.

side ; and if the Nazarenes during his discourse remember his descent from Joseph and Mary, his brothers and his sisters as dwelling in Nazara, yet there is not the shade of a suspicion, that the house came short in any way in respect of civil virtues or an Israelite's religious reputation.* In Mary's case especially, unless Galilee was freer in this as in other things, we must think of that life of retirement amounting to imprisonment, which was customary in the East and in Jerusalem, and which Philo the contemporary describes as actually prevailing among the Jewish wives and maidens of Alexandria.† A second fact is the attitude of Jesus to his nearest kindred during the time of his ministry, of which we must speak elsewhere more particularly. We here see an affectionate family intercourse, which not all the separations of a different calling, and the perilous situation of Jesus, no not even the variance of personal conviction, were sufficient to interrupt. Side by side with this, no doubt we see that unmistakeable divergence of opinion. We shall find that Mary and the brethren of Jesus did not join the company of the disciples until after his departure. We shall not see in this any proof of religious insensibility or indifference ; but still a much more even balance between fervid devotion and reflective caution than would appear from the opening narrative. Whether or no the reason was that Mary was less able than another to disentangle herself from the religious traditions of the country, or to attain to the high belief in the prophetic office of that Son, who had passed under her own human hands, the fact remains, that Jesus ranges in one line the unbelief of his family with the unbelief of his town, and has transmitted as a characteristic trait of Mary, not only her maternal affection, but her brooding

* Matt. xiii. 55, 56.

† Phil. in Flacc. 977: *κατάκλειστα κ. τ. λ.* The same writer tells us that the women of Alexandria only went to the synagogue when the streets were but thinly thronged, which however was also the rule in Jerusalem. 2 Macc. iii. 19. *αἱ δὲ κατάκλειστοι τῶν παρθένων.*

scepticism.* The attempt might readily suggest itself to gain some light regarding the house of Joseph from the history of the brethren of Jesus, especially the afterwards illustrious James, the head of the Church at Jerusalem: but the utmost that we could thence conclude, would be after all no more than the probability of a strictly moral and legal spirit having prevailed in the parental home, whereas on the other hand the Essenic manner of life ascribed to the James of later years affords but a precarious inference with regard to the earlier household, all the more so as its attestation by Hegesippus in the middle of the second century sounds legendary enough in itself. Of most importance is it to notice that the rise of a James, side by side with Jesus in this house, indeed of a circle of brethren, whose equal rank with the Apostles was scarcely due to their relationship alone, is at any rate confirmatory of our belief in the spiritual opulence of the source in question.†

With these scanty facts relating to the house of Joseph, we must, as far as history goes, content ourselves, unless we think well to open the flood-gates to the huge torrent of apocryphal Gospels which the Church has rejected, as well as of those other legends which writers of the Church have endorsed. For if the object be to solve all vexatious questions, to still every pang in the aching void of ignorance, and satisfy to the full the human craving for seeing and handling, at once to cater for the yearnings of faith, and pander to the flights of fancy,—to that end these Gospels are admirably adapted indeed. Here we have names and all. Not only does Jacob the father of Joseph appear, whom the “History of Joseph” belonging to 5th century mentions in agreement with Matthew, and by his side in still later accounts the mother Salome: the parents of Mary are still more prominent, usually bearing the appellations of Joiakim (or Joachim), and Anna, as already in the Gospel of

* Matt. xii. 47 ff. xiii. 57.

† Cf. Heges. ap. Eus. 2, 23. The brothers of Jesus, cf. 1 Cor. ix. 5.

James (2nd century).* And what a number of important accessory questions as regards calling and manner of life are here answered. Joiakim is, according to James and Matthew, a Jerusalemite, according to the later Gospel of Mary's nativity, it is true, a Nazarene; according to the latest, actually a native of Sepphoris: his calling is that of a shepherd, and because he is pious and liberal, he also enjoys the blessing of great wealth. In the time of Augustine he has come to be called a priest. Joseph, born in Bethlehem of the tribe of David, is half carpenter, half joiner; he makes yokes and ploughs, chests and milk pails, but also thrones, and besides he builds whole houses. He bears, moreover, the honourable title of the Just, and the History of Joseph makes him out too to be a man of learning, and, indeed, a priest.† Still Mary is by far his superior. Her marvellous birth, which was constantly obtaining ever wider acknowledgment in the Church, necessitated a higher and worthier conception of her antecedents. From whom could she be herself descended but from the great king David, whose blood she must have in her veins, as certainly as she was of more account than Joseph whom the older Gospels described as David's son; and as certainly as Jesus' share in David could not be so far fetched as from the foster father, but must come through that mother who was really his, and to whom he was kin by blood? Accordingly, in despite of our older Gospels, the belief arises among the fathers of the Church, and simultaneously in the Gospel of James belonging to the 2nd century, that Mary also was descended from David; a belief more tena-

* James, History of Joseph, ch. xvi. 29. His mother Salome, Niceph. H.E. ii. 3. Hofmann *Leben J. nach den Apocryphen*, 1861, p. 3 ff.

† Protev. Jac. ch. v.; ch. vii. seems to favour Galilee. Pseudomatt. ch. i.; vir in Jerusalem nomine Joachim de tribu Juda. Ev. de nativ. Mar. ch. i.; in civitate Nazareth nata. Sepphoris see Hofmann, p. 30. Joiakim πλούσιος σφόδρα Jac. i. Pious and liberal, Ib. Still mightier dimensions of greatness in Mt. ch. i. Priest, cf. Hofmann, p. 7. Joseph of Bethlehem, Jac. xvii. Hist. Jos. ii. There dwelling, Ev. d. nat. Mar. viii. Joseph's calling cf. below and Jesus', also Hofmann, p. 2. Priest: Hist. Jos. ii.; hic ipse scientia et doctrinis probe instructus sacerdos factus est in templo domini. Calluit præterea artem fabrilem lignariam.

ciously preserved than the equally unhistorical one in her Levitical and priestly antecedents, which is indicated already in Luke, afterwards in the 2nd century by the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," and to some extent by Hegesippus, was still held in the 4th and 5th centuries by the Manichees, as well as by Epiphanius and Augustine, and was further developed in the notion of the priesthood of Joiakim, Jesus himself and his brother James.*

And who can find fault with the legend for surrounding the birth and youth of the Mother of God with quite other glories besides those of noble descent from David, and adorning her with miraculous splendours, the earnest of her own great miracle? Declining to pursue in detail the even fuller development of the story of Mary's infancy, let us take it at its earliest point, as it appears in the representation of the book ascribed to James, belonging to the 2nd century. In spite of all their flocks, in spite of all their piety, Joiakim and Anna were without the blessing of children. Indeed, Reuben, a priest, reproaches him at the sacrifice because he had "no seed in Israel." In his grief Joiakim, convinced that all righteous men, Abraham among the number, obtained children, though in old age, flies from home and fasts forty days in the wilderness, in order to extort a child from God. Meanwhile Anna mourns at home as though in widowhood. At the instigation of the maid Judith, half joyful and half sad, she at length lays by her weeds on the day of the Lord's feast, arrays herself in her wedding garment, seats herself in the garden beneath a bay-tree, and beseeches God for Sarah's blessing. She looks up, and lo! on the bay-tree a nest of merry sparrows (cf. Matt. vi. 26). Not understanding the token, she

* Mary, like Joseph of Davidic race, Jac. x. Ev. d. nat. Mar. i. (on her mother's side). Cf. Justin Tryph. 43, 45 (Davidic, Judæan, Abrahamitic), Joseph at least Judæan and Bethlehemite, ch. 78. Irenæus, 3, 21, 5, also Tertullian. Priestly descent, Test. xii. patr. Levi 2; *διὰ σου (Levi) καὶ Ἰούδα ὁφθήσεται κύριος ἐν ἀνθρώποις*. In the same way Simeon, ch. 7. Ir. fragm. 17. Even the Manichees thought so, and Augustine did not deny it, cf. c. Faust, 23, 4, d. div. quæst. 61. Epiph. Hær. 78, 13. Ritschl, Altkath. Kirche, 2nd. Ed. p. 225.

utters loud complaints that God has more mercy on dumb creatures than on men. Then God is at her side ; “ Anna, Anna,” calls an angel, and announces to her a birth of which the whole world shall tell. She believes, and vows the child to the service of the Lord, whether it be male or female. Two angels now appear, and announce to her the return of Joiakim, who has been gladdened with a like message. Anna hastens to the gate ; he approaches with the flock ; she falls rejoicing on his neck. Next day Joiakim brings a rich thankoffering from his flocks, which he dedicates to God, the priests, the elders and the people. The gold plate on the high-priest’s turban, who announces forgiveness of sins to the sacrificers, gleams with pure radiance upon him, and with the consciousness of forgiveness he returns home. In the ninth month Anna brings forth, and the child is named Mary. The later Gospel of Mary’s nativity calls Anna’s a downright miraculous conception, like that of Mary, and her child appears as “ filled with the Holy Ghost from her mother’s womb.”* But to come back to the book of James. In the first half year already the child can stand alone, and hastens with seven steps to its mother’s lap. Anna, however, determines not to let it walk again upon the earth until she has presented it to the temple of the Lord. She makes a sanctuary for it in her chamber. The first anniversary of its birth is celebrated at Joiakim’s board by the priests, scribes, elders, and by the whole people. As soon as the second year is ended Joiakim is anxious for the fulfilment of the vow, but Anna waits until the third is completed, by which time the child will no longer call for father and mother. Then they take it to the temple : the child goes joyously up the steps, the priest welcomes it, blesses it, and sets it on the third step of the altar ; the child dances for joy, and all Israel bestow their affections on it.

* *Ev. d. Nativ. Mar. iii. ; mirabiliter ex sterili nata. Uterum claudit Deus, ut mirabilius denuo aperiat. — Non libidinis, quod nascitur, sed divini muneris. — Spiritu sancto replebitur adhuc ex utero matris.*

The offering in the temple is recompensed to the parents by the birth of the second Mary.

The first grew up in the Temple like a dove, and took her food from an angel's hand, until with her twelfth year the priests began to consult about her marriage. The sequel we leave for the present, as it is altogether concerned with the questions affecting the birth of Jesus.*

Beautiful and suggestive as is much in this tale, yet it is mingled with abundance of the fabulously marvellous in glorification of Mary, which is partly refuted by the silence of the older Gospels, and partly by their direct contradiction. It were a hopeless task to attempt the separation of what is genuine and what is spurious. If, as frequently enough, a desire is shown for retaining the scanty remnant that the parents of Mary are correctly named, who cares to object? True, even here we find there is no certainty. For as this story, following in the steps of our older Gospels, is fond of going back to the Old Testament, to Hannah, and almost more to Manoah, the father of Samson—and taking its shape from these antecedents, so is it natural to conjecture that in the name of Mary's mother we have but an echo of the mother of Samuel; in the name of Joiakim a suggestive play of words (the Lord will raise up), in his shepherd life a commendation of the Israelite's favourite calling, a copy of Manoah or of David, and a type of many a reminiscence in the Gospel story. Indeed Jesus himself is painted by the Gnostic Justinus a shepherd twelve years old, at the moment when Baruch brings him the revelation of God.†

* Jac. i.-viii.

† Hippol. Philos. 5, 26.

SECOND DIVISION.—THE CRADLE.

The entrance of great men into the world's history is wont to gather round it clouds of mystery. As manifestations of towering grandeur which mock at all endeavours to explain them by the cognizable forces and self-repeating cycles of their age and their surroundings, they do constitute a real mystery, which merges in its turn into the unsolved riddle of universal being and growth. But to the mystery of the reality is added the mystery of the imagination, as often as the restless impulse of the human mind to seek and find solutions, attempts by dint of surmising and pondering, by dint of thinking and picturing, to fathom the ground of the original reality. The warmer the love, the deeper the earnest of the effort, the richer the result which will be won, and the more secure its possession.

The knowledge thus presumedly gained becomes indissolubly blent with the reality itself; the interpretation proclaims itself as simply the reality laid bare, made manifest. The fact itself of course always remains, after all, what it was, in its unattained sublimity; it smiles at human endeavour; now commending the good intention which the picture shows, now praising its fine sense, now blaming the sensuousness that mars it, but deploring almost always not only the confusion of fact with the figure, but also the loss of the unsophisticated truth's original simplicity.

It is notorious enough how this primitive philosophy of history, with its poetic afterthoughts, has garlanded the birth of great kings and generals, sages and founders of religion, with the most luxuriant legendary wreaths of divine descent, flaming signs from heaven, and miraculous escapes, until the original handwriting of history is so overhung with flowery forest-growth as to be no longer legible, or is altogether effaced. It cannot be said in so many words; it was otherwise with the

rise of Christianity. The sublime truth of Christianity by no means precludes such appendages. On the contrary, the more the entrance of Jesus into the world be conceived of as the riddle of riddles—yes, the wonder, in presence of which every other inexplicable growth becomes pale and shadowy—the more imperiously has it constrained the mind of man to highest flights of thought and emulous efforts of reflexion. The most that one can say on the other side is, that so grand a fact as the birth of Jesus ran least risk of being too loftily idealised by human arts. Whoso meets here with sublime interpretations will be less prone to ask whether he finds too much than whether he does not find too little. In this sense shall we criticize. We shall not be concerned to bespatter the highest of earthly histories, but rather to keep it clear of coarser conceptions, to strip off the temporary garb of lofty thoughts, and with full affection for fundamental idealities of view, yield the original material reality its rights without abridgment. By such a conciliatory process we gladly come back to all high feeling, vision, thought, that the birth of Christ has from earliest time inspired, willingly and joyfully renew the permanent foundation-thoughts with sharply chiselled outline and fresh living hues, and as we deal with this discovery of hoary eld, bear one more testimony to the truth, that the historical picture of Jesus must, for those who can receive it, shine resplendent in all centuries with the same bright sunbeams, though ever and again (who can deny it?) through the dark glass and narrow ranges of human sight.

FIRST SECTION.—THE GENERAL QUESTION OF THE HUMAN BIRTH.

It is the surest sign of the influence of men's views invading the province of objective history, when we find the story of the birth of Jesus, a fact seemingly so easy to substantiate, handed down to us not only in all manner of varieties, but in actually contradictory versions. These contradictions, plain even to the

naked eye, in the midst of the sacred sources of Christianity, are like a heavenly warning against a one-sided preference for the one or the other of these accounts, by which haply a piety as slavish as it is enslaving thinks to erect a bulwark of the Faith; on the contrary, their immediate summons is a call to the most unprejudiced comparison, and a conclusion grounded on the most reliable indications, and the common rules of human reasoning.

Within as well as without the limits of the Gospels, yes, amid the circles which in earliest time surrounded Jesus, the view was at first current that the birth of Jesus had taken place essentially in accordance with that natural order by which the origin of human life is wont to be conditioned.

The people in whose midst Jesus made his appearance know him as the son of Joseph and Mary. "Is not he a carpenter's son; is not his mother's name Mary?" is the cry which greets him from Nazara, his native town. And even the fourth Gospel makes no secret of the inquiring exclamation of the Jews in Capernaum: "Is not this Jesus Joseph's son, whose father and mother we know?"

This is no voice of calumny, but serious conviction: albeit this conviction asserts itself as the *point d'appui* of that unbelieving doubt which rebels against greatness on account of its humble origin. Even within the circle of the disciples of Jesus this same conviction finds utterance; here, however, unaccompanied by doubt; we have found him, says Philip in the fourth Gospel to Nathanael, of whom Moses and the prophets wrote, Jesus the son of Joseph of Nazara.* If two of our Gospels, those of Matthew and Luke, at least in their introductory narratives, drawn partly from late sources, and partly modified from an earlier form, have denied this birth from *Joseph* and Mary, yet not only do they expressly concede, in part, in their oldest portions that the people quite generally held a

* Matt. xiii. 55. Mark vi. 3. Luke iv. 22. John i. 45; vi. 42.

different view, but they even give genealogies of Jesus, which at great length exhibit him as the son of David, through his sonship to Joseph, which could only have been devised by their original authors in the belief that he was actually Joseph's son, which finally could be watered down by the later compilers to the notion of a sonship to Mary alone, and foster-sonship to Joseph,* only by doing the most palpable violence, not merely to the essential form of the Jewish pedigree which is dependent on the names of men, but still more to the fundamental thought which underlies documents valueless except they demonstrate a blood-relationship to the father. Even to us, with our cooler regard for pedigrees and genuine purity of blood, it is obvious that a foster-son could have but a highly precarious part in the glory of his nominal father's blood; but in the Jewish view, which supplies the motive for these pedigrees, from all that we know, the non-possession of the blood, of the seed, annihilated every shadow of those claims, which were supposed to accompany the material presence of that seed, which somehow or another was there,—and hence the male pedigree.†

Elsewhere in the New Testament there is no express mention of a sonship to Joseph, or indeed of the parents of Jesus at all; the Apostle Paul at most speaking of Jesus as born of a woman, in a connexion and a sense which decisively decline to say a word in support of any breach of ordinary conditions, whether

* Luke iii. 23. Jesus was *supposed to be* a son of Joseph. The violence of the transition from the *real* descent to the *imaginary* may be seen in the accounts themselves and in the form of their expression, Luke iii. 23. Matt. i. 16. Cf. on this point, Lightf. p. 250 (Iuchas, f. 55, 2): familia materna non vocanda est familia. Bab. bathr. f. 110: genus patris vocatur genus, g. matris non vocatur g. Also Winer, Real-Wört. Art. Stamm, Geschlechtsregister, Jesus.

† One need only look at the expressions: seed, having no seed, raise up seed, seed of the kingdom, 2 Kings xi. 1. For the sake of Abram's seed the handmaid's son becomes a people, Gen. xxi. 13. One brother raises up seed for the other as of kindred substance. Gen. xxxviii. 8. Deut. xxv. 5. The above would not preclude an intimate relation between foster-father and foster-son: cf. the example in Shem. Rabba (ille qui educat vocatur pater, non ille qui generat) cited by Lightf. 503.

of birth or of national education, even in the case of this greatest of all comers.

But what is of much more weight, we can still everywhere discern an evident trace of that father who in the Gospels is named Joseph. Let us call to mind the passages in which Jesus is called the son of David. In one place, where Paul is describing his human antecedents, he calls him born of the seed of David according to the flesh : an expression of which there is an after-echo in the 2nd of Timothy. Elsewhere he repeatedly calls him, with genealogical emphasis, the seed of Abraham. The speech, too, of Paul in Antioch, reported in Acts, makes mention of the same thing : "out of the seed of David has God raised up Jesus the Saviour of Israel."

Jewish Christian documents, as the sources of Acts and the Revelation of John, use no other language concerning him ; the Acts go so far as to lay special stress on the material connexion with David's manly vigour.* It were but an ingenious subterfuge from these modes of tracing the lineage, to expound with a modern theologian of Erlangen : "'Seed of David :' *i.e.* a member of that collective whole, which traces back its origin to David !" For neither did the "collective whole" of Israel trace back their physical descent to David, nor can the Christian authors have understood the characteristic mark by which they distinguished him personally, and by which they intended to ennoble him in the eyes of Israel, as if it were something that he shared with the "collective whole."† Far more plausibly might one affirm that the distinction of Jesus as the seed of David or of Abraham, left it undecided whether he owed his connexion with the Prince of Israel actually to his father, and not rather to his mother. But here again, also, the Jewish method of reckoning offers a cogent objection : true, the

* Gal. iv. 4. *γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον.* Rom. i. 3 : *γενόμενον ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα.* Gal. iii. 16, and Rom. iv. 13 : *σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ.* Further 2 Tim. ii. 8. Acts xiii. 23; ii. 30. Rev. v. 5; xxii. 16.

† Hofmann, Weiss. u. Erfüll. II. 49.

ancestral dame appears from time to time as secondary depository of the lineage of Adam or Abraham, but the God-appointed fully-privileged vehicle is the man and the man alone, the transmitter and propagator only the male descendant, and every pedigree, Jesus' included, is composed of men, even if from time to time mention is made of the women's contribution to the result, whether it be traced from Abraham to David, from David to Zerubabel, from Zerubabel to Jesus.* Add to this that the more detailed reminiscences of Christendom fastened the continuity of the seed of David in the family of Jesus altogether on the man, Joseph, without a trace of any connexion of Mary therewith, and not an inch of room is left for the conjecture that Mary, the mother, may be meant by Paul and the rest, as the vehicle of Davidic lineage.

Far beyond the boundaries of the Apostolic age the belief survived that Jesus was the offspring of Joseph and Mary. It was maintained with passionate fervour in Jewish Christian circles, where ancient reminiscence, the genuinely Jewish view of the sacredness of wedlock, and the rather legal than evangelical ground which they occupied, worked together towards the same result.

Accordingly Cerinthus the Jewish Christian, in the beginning of the second century, and other Gnostics in his train, declared Jesus the son of Joseph and Mary; important Judæo-Christian writings of the second century, as the Clementines, fully held to the standpoint of his simple and complete humanity, and from the second to the fifth centuries are scattered descriptions of two Jewish Christian sects, which are usually distinguished as Nazarenes and Ebionites,—of whom the first acknowledged the virgin birth, the other believed in an ordinary human birth, the result of the intercourse of Joseph and Mary; this the Ebionites undertook to demonstrate from the celebrated

* Cf. Ruth iv. 17 ff. 1 Chron. iii. 10 ff. Ancestresses as bearers of lineage, e.g. Gen. iii. 15; xvi. 10. cf. xxi. 13. For the rest see page 41 Note.

passage in Isaiah (not "damsel" but "young dame"); the school of Cerinthus with critical acumen from the evidence of the pedigrees in our Gospels.* Even the Acts of Pilate mention the belief in a descent from Joseph and Mary on the part of the Jews and Christians.†

With this conception of Jesus' antecedents the Church at large from early times was however but ill satisfied. Nay, the conception, as it stood, was constantly employed in self-emendation, placing side by side with the natural birth a preternatural manifestation of the Spirit, in the course of that life, which in no case waived its claim to single and celestial glory. Plain traces of these successive exaltations of the human dignity of Jesus, are found already in the New Testament, *e.g.*, in the Acts, where the "Seed of David" appears at the same time as the Prophet anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power; and quite in kindred fashion are the old traditions of our Gospels concerning the miraculous outpouring of the Spirit of God upon Jesus on the threshold of his ministry, with its train of divino declarations concerning the Son in whom God was well pleased. Building upon these foundations, later Jewish Christendom from Cerinthus to the Clementines, spoke, quite commonly, of a descent of the Spirit or of the "Upper Christ" upon Jesus, and was fond of connecting the descent like Cerinthus and the Jewish Gospels, with the baptism.‡ These emendations amounted after all to a confession that the original formula of ordinary human birth in the case of Jesus, was not quite sufficient to explain his personality; who would forbid the

* Just. Tr. 45 ff. Iren. 1., 26, 2. 3, 21, 1. Hippol. p. 151. Cf. Eus. 3, 27. 5, 8. Orig. c. Cels. 5, 61. Jerome Ep. 89, ad Gal. ad Eph. Epiphani. Hær. 30 § 14. De Wette, 117. Similarly Carpocrates Ir. 1, 25, 1. Artemonites (ψιλός ἄνθρωπος) Eus. 5, 28. Cf. Hagenbach, Dogm. G. 5th Ed. 1807, p. 137 ff. Ritschl, Altkath. Kirche, Ed. 2, 156 f. Acta Pilati Ch. 1: τοῦτον οἶδαμεν [τὸν Ἰησοῦν] ὄντα υἱὸν Ἰωσήφ τοῦ τέκτονος ἀπὸ Μαρίας γεννηθέντα. Cf. Ch. 2.

† Acts x. 38. cf. Luke xxiv. 19. Matt. iii. 16. ff. and the parallel passages.

‡ On Cerinthus Iren. loc. cit. 1, 26, 2 and Vol. I. p. 201. Clem. Hom. 2, 10. 3, 12. 20; and elsewhere. Cf. Just. Tryph. 49. Ebion. Gosp. Epiph. Hær. 30 § 13 cf. Jerome on the Nazar. Gosp. ad Jes. 11, 1.

Church in place of the patchwork of a double explanation, in place of artificial piecemeal improvements, whose various stages nullified each other—to press onwards to a fundamental conception of the origin of Jesus loftier from the first and capable of organic development? In the Jewish Christian, as well as in the Hellenistic and Heathen Christian section of the Church the attempt was stirring, undertaken by each side in its own way.

Upon Jewish Christian ground the belief arose in a miraculous origin of Jesus by means of a virgin birth. Two of our Gospels have cleared the way for this belief far beyond the limits of their own age; the first and the third. Apocryphal Gospels follow suit abundantly enough. The Jewish Christian starting point of these accounts betrays itself not only in the general tone and spirit of the same, especially in the manipulation of a prophecy of the Old Testament—but also in the literary conditions under which these Gospels arose. The first Gospel is notoriously derived, original document as well as later redaction, from a Jewish Christian source. The third Gospel, though from a Pauline hand, has with special preference inserted throughout its introductory narrative older Jewish Christian materials almost word for word. The age of these tales cannot be placed far back; in the first Gospel they can hardly be counted as part of the groundwork of the book, which more likely with Mark, began with the baptism of John; and on that account alone fall below 70 A.D.; in the third Gospel, whose rise lies far enough on this side the destruction of Jerusalem (80-90 A.D.), the Jewish Christian portions even of the introductory narrative in spirit, matter, and form, show the colouring of a later time than that of Matthew himself. We may therefore safely call these accounts post-apostolic, and, above all, post-Pauline; the latter, if only for this reason, that Paul and the rest of the New Testament, have as yet no inkling of a miraculous birth of Jesus; which indeed finds no strong support until after the middle of the second century in the pages of Justin, in the Epistles of Ignatius, and in the Gospel of

James.* According then to the additions in Matthew, and according to Luke, Mary is betrothed to Joseph, and is blessed with offspring before any contact with him. Matthew, with chaste reserve, says, "She was found with child of the Holy Ghost." Luke, following his source of information, draws a more sensuous picture of the heavenly mystery: the Holy Ghost descended upon her: the power of the Highest visibly overshadowed her in the form of a cloud, in which the hidden God comes near to mortal men; the fruit of this divine proximity is the child she bears beneath her bosom.†

We naturally ask, what is the Holy Ghost which descends on Mary, and what the child as thereby begotten? It is a frivolous assertion that the sacred writers have made God the begetter of Jesus, in place of the man. Were it so, indeed, we should have right in the midst of Judæism jealous of the purity of its conception of the Deity, Greek mythology, and a recurrence of the legends about Zeus, to which, groundlessly enough, Strauss has had recourse. But the Holy Ghost is not God as a Person, but the creative power of God, through which He makes, pervades, sustains his universe, and awakes in his own chosen spirits, whether from the birth onward, or by means of a call during the course of their life's history, the physical or mental forces of strength, of knowledge, of volition. In this sense, the idea of the Spirit of God or of the Holy Spirit, as one exalted high above the profane and impure world, runs through the Bible, from the Book of Creation to the Books of the Prophets: and in the discourses of Jesus himself, it is this operative spirit of God, by means of which David acknowledges the Messiah, the Apostles find speech and answers in presence of kings and magistrates, and he himself, as possessed of that spirit, drives out devils, and destroys the realm of Satan.‡ And so too in the story before us, the operative Spirit of God

* Cf. Just. Apol. 1. 46 c. Tryph. 45, &c. Ignat. ad Eph. 7. 18. Smyrn. 1.

† Matt. i. 18-25. Luke i. 26-38.

‡ Matt. x. 19, 20. xii. 28, 31. xxii. 43.

is nothing else than the creative working of God, forming for himself in the world his mighty instruments: at one time as the Gospel of Luke, almost in the same connexion, relates of the Baptist's Birth,—or Paul in Romans of the birth of Isaac,—by God's vouchsafing children to the barrenness and weakness of old age; at another, as this same history of Luke represents it, by the Spirit of God uniting itself from the birth onwards to what man has begotten with elevating and exalting power; at another, finally, in the highest energy of divine operation, by the subsidence of human co-operation in presence of the Divine creative activity into nothing or next to nothing; so that there is no co-operating father, only a conceiving mother—the Virgin Mary.* What they thought of and acknowledged as the fruit of this Seed of God, the two writers have made no secret. According to Matthew it is a “Jesus” who, as born of the Holy Ghost, is able to redeem his people from their sins; and an Immanuel or perfect “God-with-us.” According to Luke it is a “Holy Thing,” a something divinely separate from the world, a Great One, a Son of the Highest, the offspring of the might of God, and in conclusion, to crown his intrinsic dignity, he is Lord of the Throne of David, the everlasting King of Jacob's house.†

Even before this attempt at explanation on the part of Jewish Christianity, there had established itself in those circles of Gentile Christendom which were fertilized by contact with the Hellenism of Alexandrine Jews, a conception of the antecedents of Jesus, which made rapid way for itself, and has survived in the Church to this day,—whether the virgin-birth has been sacrificed to this higher, less objectionable, and more tenable opinion, or whether—and this since Justin has been the current, complacent, accommodating view—the attempt has been made to retain both the one and the other side by side.‡ This is the

* Cf. Luke i. 15, 36. Rom. iv. 17-21.

† Matt. 18 ff. Luke i. 26 ff.

‡ This comfortable way of regarding the matter must naturally find in Paul already

belief in a higher heavenly existence of the person of Jesus previous to his life in time. It is chiefly represented in the Pauline epistles, and that, without doubt, already in the earliest, and not only as the school of Tübingen formerly supposed in the later letters to the Colossians, Ephesians, and Philippians, as well as in the Paulinizing Epistle to the Hebrews; finally, in the Johannine writings, Gospel and Epistles; by no means, however, in the Revelation, where, though undoubtedly distinguishing titles of Deity are transferred to Christ as celestially glorified through death and resurrection: yet on the other hand every pretence of pre-existence dissolves in froth as soon as it is touched.* The Apostle Paul at the close of his fiftieth year, very shortly after the lapse of twenty years from the time of Jesus' departure, regards him as the leader of the second order of humanity, as the heavenly, heaven-sent and glorified Man, succeeding to the first adamitic, earthy, coarse-minded order of mankind; and, therefore, not merely as a man, but as a Lord, side by side with God, as the image of God. His own Son, through whom all things were made, who as the spiritual rock led Israel with blessing through the wild; who, lastly, though he was rich, yet for our sake became poor; came to earth in the likeness of our flesh, in order to be a sinless Redeemer from sin, emancipating humanity until it attained the higher image of God, the spirituality and spiritual corporeality of the heavenly human ideal.* Quite similarly, only more rhetorically, is he described in the later Epistle to the

along with the pre-existence the virgin-birth. That this does not exist in Gal. iv. 4 is known to exegesis. For this passage has to do solely with a summary of the conditions, the limitations of Jesus' human existence, not with their opposite.

* Among the Paul. letters that to the Galatians contains already the elements of the subsequent theory of the Corinthian epistles. Cf. only Gal. iii. 27, iv. 4 ff. On the Apocalypse see for a short statement Baur's *Neutestam. Theologie*, 1864, p. 214 ff. Yet Baur has not observed that though Jesus is called indeed the First and the Last, and that with reference to his death and resurrection (i. 17 f. ii. 8, and elsewhere), on the other hand as a rule only God is the Alpha and Omega. With iii. 14 cf. xii. 17. Rom. viii. 29. James i. 18.

† 1 Cor. xv. 45-49. viii. 6. x. 1-4. 2 Cor. iii. 18. iv. 4. v. 17. 21. viii. 9. Rom. v. 12-21. viii. 29. 32. Cf. above, Vol. I. p. 61.

Hebrews as the possessor of the eternal Spirit, as the reflexion of God's glory, and the express image of his person, the first begotten with the title of God, through whom the worlds were made, for whose sake all was created, and who upholdeth all things by the word of his might.* The fourth Gospel reiterated and crowned this sublime conception, not only by the still somewhat timidly uttered sentence that the "Word" or the only begotten Son, who from the beginning was with God, and through whom all things were made, is to be regarded as essential God by God's side; but also by introducing the kernel of this conception into the discourses of Jesus himself, who without calling himself exactly God in so many words, at least called himself one with the Father, and claimed an existence in glory before Abraham, yes, before the foundation of the world.† At the same time these writers have not denied the human birth, not even the epistle to the Hebrews, which speaks of him as sprung from Juda, although it characterizes him as without father, without mother, like the mysterious King of Salem, Melchisedek. Paul saw in Jesus expressly, not only the essential man, but also the seed of David, born of a woman; and the fourth Gospel while certainly silent about the birth, yet reports at least the confident conviction of the people with regard to the father and mother, and if any would here haply find an example of the irony of the writer, yet he gives us at any rate the exclamation of one Apostle to the other, which cannot be explained away; "Jesus the Son of Joseph from Nazara."‡ The difficulties in which these writers were however entangled, as soon as they attempted to grant, curtail or deny the human origin of the God-born Son, cannot here be discussed, beyond

* Hebrews i. 1-14. ii. 5 ff. vii. 3. ix. 14.

† John i. 1-18. x. 30. xiv. 9. xviii. 58. xvii. 5. That the Logos as such is already too the Son, although as a rule this idea comes out first in the case of the Incarnate, is shown by passages such as i. 14, 18. iii. 16. Hausrath, p. 27, would distinguish between Palestinian and Alexandrian Schools, so that Paul would represent the former, John the latter.

‡ Heb. vii. 3, 14. Rom. i. 3. Gal. iv. 4. John i. 46. vi. 42.

the reminder that they passed over these ticklish questions pretty rapidly by means of the phrase Incarnation.

If we ask ourselves, with which of these fundamental theories, now set forth at length, we can best get on, the first remains after all in many respects far superior to the others. It is unmistakably the earliest, and it is something more one may say than a *theory*, for that in its very nature rests upon ideas, upon a mixture of men's thoughts with the case,—it is a primitive view of the contemporaries, of the people of the Apostles, of the whole infant Church. From those circles of which the first Apostles were the centre, we have not a single reliable trace, not even in the later letters, which are ascribed to them, that this view was finally overstepped by them.* Not even the two later theories knew altogether how to break with this firm historic ground or to get it out of their way. The Gospels which espouse the virgin-birth, undesignedly introduce the echoes of the popular view from earlier times, in the utterances of contemporaries, in the pedigrees, in the accounts of the miracle at the Baptism, side by side with the miracle of the Birth; and even through the new form of the story the old record is always sounding; for Joseph is always reappearing, if not as husband, still as betrothed, if not as Father, still as Guardian, from the time of the Conception onwards; yes always reappearing even in the mouth of the angel announcing prodigies to come—as the true Son of David, whose offshoot shall ascend the throne of David his forefather.†

Finally, Paul and John not only show traces of the original representation, but in the midst of their higher ideal flight, have held fast the unsophisticated fact. The plain state of the case is that here if anywhere, historical investigation is in a position to conclude with definite results. Over statements so

* Even the first Petrine epistle, not written till the reign of Trajan, has, i. 20, only an ideal pre-existence: *προεγνωμένος*, an idea which is a final point of contact for all Christians, Rom. viii. 29. The Ep. of James has notoriously the most meagre Christology. Christians are God-born, i. 18. Of the so-called Johannine literature we spoke in the Introduction.

† Cf. Matt. i. 20. Luke i. 27, 32.

significant and so abundant, dogmatic prejudice can leap away as it can across all history : historic judgment can only fix as the most immediate certainty, that which the earliest tradition offers. If afterwards it should appear that the later theories furnish many a notable contribution to the solution of the ultimate questions in this domain of thought, perhaps just these ultimate questions will yet in their turn cast a still more favourable light upon that tradition, in which we sought for the primitive reality.

The two latter theories have their strong point in the greater conceivability which they appear to lend to the signal consequences of this Birth. The miraculously virgin-born, *i.e.* the product of fresh divine creative forces, may be quite otherwise than a "mere man," than an offshoot of earthly inherited law, the vehicle of the Spirit of God, of miraculous powers, the One with God, the sinless among men. Finally, the Only Begotten from Heaven, explains most triumphantly not only this new doctrine concerning God, but also the infinite oneness with God, in the consciousness of the Man Jesus ; and in the world-creating Son are solved the riddles of the actual work in the world, and of that eternal claim upon the world, which links itself with the name Jesus (Saviour).

But to begin with, theories are not authorities. They are ideas void of perceptions, which cannot appeal to ancient historical witness. True, the view of the Apostle Paul reaches back to the year twenty after Jesus' departure from earth ; but it is purely the result of his dogmatic reasoning, and by no means of tradition which he found ready to his hand. If he speaks of historical traditions of the Church in Jerusalem, it is certain that he proved only the Death and Resurrection, never the pre-existence of Jesus in this way. Nor have we a trace that in the earliest apostolic circles, those of Peter, James, John, this tradition could have been presented to Paul. Finally, he himself never laid special stress upon this doctrine, which he treated rather by way of hypothesis or inference,

and never made it binding on the Church. It was on the Resurrection that he built; and that he did make binding. The accounts of the first and third Gospels and of the fourth lack besides the support of any considerable antiquity. And, to be outspoken, all these theories are flatly opposed to the earliest narrative. This is manifest in the case of the virgin-birth, unless we are to take refuge in the cheap expedient of supposing the narrative which makes Joseph the father was the coarse surface view, while that of the virgin-birth was in accordance with the intimate perception of the familiar circle. To say so is laughable; for so great a wonder could far less escape the attention of the Jews than an ordinary birth; and because, to crown all, this more "intimate perception" never penetrated to Peter and Paul—no, not even, as it seems, to Mary! But the story of the Pre-existent also contradicts the earlier account, and the later tale of the virgin-birth, in a breath: whatever later combinations might be made of these inconsistent materials. For the plain original hypothesis of the two narratives embodying the latter view is that of an absolutely fresh beginning of a new life—be it from the seed of David, be it from the might of God—not that of a mere change in form of a being long in existence, yes, long conscious, which clothed itself for the nonce in fleshly garb. Besides this, the theory in question is at variance with many another undoubtedly ancient reminiscence. To begin with, the people who wonderingly inquire, Whence hath he this wisdom? are quite left in the dark as to his having received it before the earth was made. But New Testament writers, too, beginning with historical writers, have, in the large majority of cases, no room for prehistoric history. Most important of all—not a single book, except the fourth Gospel, knows anything of sayings of Jesus concerning his pre-existence; none, the fourth Gospel itself included, of any disclosures on the part of Jesus, enabling us to conjecture an experimental knowledge derived from "yonder worlds;" and the laborious efforts which have been made to find up amid the richly accu-

mulated treasure of the sayings of Jesus in the three first Gospels, which have been gathered together assuredly with no anxiously discriminative care, and assuredly with the highest sense of the greatness of Jesus—the faintest inkling of a thought of Pre-existence in the mouth of Jesus, have ended in complete futility, one might say absurdity.* There is no result of modern research more certainly established, by the confession even of the champions of the fourth Gospel, than the observation that this book, with all its discourses concerning pre-existence, which it puts in the mouth of Jesus daily in such rich abundance, is not to be regarded as a reliable authority.†

Reason, moreover, finds itself but ill satisfied with these two theories. It experiences the greatest offence, at least the most immediate shock, at the doctrine of the virgin-birth. We conceive of the permanent arrangements of the world as ordinances sacred and divine. Here we are asked to recognize an entirely isolated breach of these ordinances. The narrative itself draws a conspicuous picture of the seriousness of that breach, by attempting to retain at least a fragment of these ordinances, namely the mother's share in conception and in birth. One can hardly avoid the question, whether the creative activity which must, will, can, preserve intact one natural factor, will not or cannot extend that clemency to the other, and yet attain its object. We are just as much tempted to ask, whether the object was attained by the one factor, and a hindrance removed by the exclusion of the other? As to the first point, it seems clear, that in that which was born, a com-

* To the notion of Son of Man, Kingdom of Heaven, not (only) of woman born, (Matt. xi. 11) appeal can scarcely any longer be made, nor yet to Luke xi. 49, where the *σοφία Θεοῦ*, according to the sense of the words, is distinguished as something else than Jesus. Passages like Matt. xviii. 10, 14. xix. 8. xxv. 34 f. xiii. 17, which seem to me most to claim consideration, must be quite otherwise expounded. The appeal of Luthardt to Matt. xxii. 42 f., of Hofmann to Luke x. 18, is laughable. Only in time and history does Jesus enter on his higher status, Matt. xi. 27. xxviii. 18. and his *ὑπάγειν* = departure (xxvi. 24. viii. 4. xviii. 15) is an *εἰσελθεῖν εἰς δόξαν*, not an *ἐπανελθεῖν*, Luke xxiv. 26 cf. xix. 12, 15.

† Cf. Vol. I. p. 180.

plete humanity was aimed at, but not accomplished. It is not on an even footing of birth with the rest of mankind, for the conditions of its existence are quite different, and the dower of manly human nature is withheld from Him, the very one who was destined to be a man above all others. As to the second point, it is plain, that the contamination which was sought to be excluded along with the father's share in procreation, comes in all the same in that of the mother.

If the human share in the process, is, as Schmid still would have it, to be shut out or limited, because the human has the character of the weak, the sinful; and because in accordance with the views of later times sinful lust is bound up with the wedded life, and sows the germ of sin in those begotten; then, one would suppose, the mother would by herself have transferred the weak and sinful character to the child, and her organic function from conception to birth would naturally in some way or other include that sensual excitement, whose influence appears so threatening to the offspring.

This objection has been strikingly put before now by Schleiermacher in his *Glaubenslehre*, and it is easy enough to see, that there are only three ways of meeting it open to us: either with the latest Roman dogma to say: Mary in order to conceiving sinlessly, herself was sinlessly conceived: or again to formulate a newer dogma still, a Protestant one of course, and say that by a miracle which brought the course of the world for awhile to a standstill, Mary was made divinely sinless during the decisive period; so that the organic process to which she was subject was freed from its prevailing character of sensual susceptibility: or finally, the third and by far the best alternative, is to return to the opinion of the primitive Docetæ, that Jesus became flesh, without father and without mother, at most by an apparent passage through the maternal ducts of one who neither in good earnest conceived, nor in good earnest bare him. These desperate expedients, show that this manner of birth shelves away until it issues in the pure denial of all birth, in the end of human history.

Less offensive at first sight is the birth in time of one who was before all time.

It does not at any rate preclude the full reality of a human birth; it only adds a background which does not touch at all experience and her laws. But in fact this background is threatening enough to the foreground: it makes the true humanity of Jesus still more of an illusion than does the birth from a virgin. The personality produced by the entrance among men of a personality that had its being before all time, bears far less still of the character of likeness to the race, than the personality which, in however wholly different a manner, is still wholly born in time.

Even if such a pre-existent being were regarded in entire accordance with Pauline views as nothing more than an ideal and perfect man, still the indispensable note of humanity, namely, that of a being taking its rise from the earth, coming into existence in succession, and bounded by time, would be altogether wanting; at most it could appropriate such a characteristic in quite a secondary manner by placing itself somehow in relation with a man who *had* been born in time. Far worse do matters grow, when we consider that the Pre-existent is regarded both by Paul and by John as not only an ideal man in knowledge and morality, but as a world-creating, world-ruling, *i.e.* divine Being.

With such conceptions there is an end, not merely of essential tokens of humanity, but of the absolutely fundamental marks of human, *i.e.* creaturely limited existence: and the attempted patching of this more than creaturely being with the birth of a created man, introduces in place of a settlement, only the culmination of confusion, inasmuch as to think of created and uncreated forming together but one being not only explodes the existence of such a being as a man, but blows all our conceptions to atoms. We have no intention of pursuing in detail the intellectual difficulties of such a theory: the very point at which we are standing is our justification for asking

how such a theory can make *human birth* conceivable? The first advocates of this theory did not pursue the question further, at most Paul has spoken of a "being clothed with flesh," of a "becoming poor," or in later letters of a "self emptying" of the Son of God as he passed from the form of God to the form of a servant: whereas the Gospel according to John wholly repudiated the task, which it certainly was its duty, if that of any one, to perform—of describing the transition of the Son of God into the flesh, by more than the bare statement of the fact. The theory of Paul himself was at one time too vague to be serviceable, at another again quite untenable: considering that he portrayed the self-denying God who would not seize on the Godhead, like a man, and that he seeks the difference between the human and divine, not in consciousness, not in the sphere of spirit, but in the sphere of might.

The God divested of might seemed then a man to him, and still was not a man, because the divine self-consciousness remained to him, and even the garb of flesh with which he was enswathed, according to Paul's own word, only lent him a quasi-humanity (Rom. viii. 3, Phil. ii. 7).

All the more room for free play was left to later times; but the centuries and milleniums which have brooded over the mystery, have produced but one assured result—inconceivabilities! Who would desire here to follow the long-winded process of the history of dogma? Speaking largely, there were only two things possible. Either the birth of the pre-existent was maintained in earnest; then the divine was humanized; the human at the same time deified and destroyed. Or the essentially separate was separated: the pre-existent has a human essence which was born, which possesses a human body, soul, and spirit, having taken them up into union with himself. But then men found they had split the one Christ, in spite of all devices and expedients to the contrary, into two beings; they had two spirits, a double consciousness; and faith forlornly doubted which to seek to, the

Man in whom she had too little, or the God in whom she had too much.

Miserably did the Church drift to and fro between these two views, which we may shortly distinguish as the Alexandrine and the Antiochian. The end was that she had to give in to the Antiochianism which she had long hated; the Synod of Chalcedon (451) deciding once for all for the fundamental idea of the Antiochians in the doctrines of the two whole, unmingled natures in Christ—human and divine; together with the scanty solace that above the duality of natures she possessed a unity of person, a unity which as far as words could go, yes, according to the afterwards popular opinion of the impersonality of human nature, almost in deed as well, was without a flaw.

Our own age has tried its hand. In the Antiochians it liked the sundering of natures, less the duplicity of essence; in the Alexandrians it liked the unity of substance, less the confusion of persons. Was it not possible, starting from the duality, from the contrasts, by a free combination of Pauline thought with Hegelian dialectic to attain to a mutual resolution of contradictions which perhaps were not so stubborn after all? Accordingly we are told of a self-emptying (*Kenosis*) of the divine essence, of a waiving of divine attributes, of a determination to undergo a completely human birth, to sink into embryonic unconsciousness, to condescend to the twilight glimmer of child-life, to a genuinely human growth of body and of soul, knowledge and moral spontaneity; but at the same time we hear of the transcendent consequences of this resolution carried out in good earnest,—of a development of the man to the point of deification, of an “uncompelled gyration,” a happy self-recovery, a return to the glory for a while cut short, then rising by fresh growth to the stature of a splendid reinstatement. This is the form which the newest and best advocacy of this theory has assumed in the hands of the school of Erlangen (*Hofmann*, *Thomasius*), and which, in spite of its biblical starting point, is opposed even by conserva-

tive as well as by the half-free theology, at whose head Dorner stands. It is mere trifling. Opposites of approved divergence cannot now-a-days be peacefully wrapped up together. Opposites again in which one must now make further incisions in order to tie them up tolerably, will not grow so quickly into one body. Close as the contact may be, nay ought to be and must be, between the divine and the human, Godhead and Manhood are metaphysically distinct in Nature, and parted each from each by the very climax of spiritual existence, its personal autonomy. The Godhead does not fit into an embryo; no embryo will ever grow into a God, but only into a man.

The waiving of divine being by itself is either meant in earnest or it is not. If it be meant in earnest, then the divine Being has given itself up, or indeed annihilated itself; in that case sure enough there is room for a human being, but in that case also this human being has no prospect of deification, and most of all the historical Christ is without everything which, according to the annals of his mere humanity, constitute his grandeur, viz., oneness with God. If this waiving of divinity is not meant in earnest, then true enough, in mockery of all the records, we have continually repeated pulsations of the full stream of godlike life, supremest knowledge, and wisdom; involuntarily sinless—even creative action in the apparently pure and simple man; yes, even in the embryo! In this way no doubt the "Return" will be accomplished without any miracles, but in this way too the divine in Christ is dishonoured, the human adulterated, the raising of Man to union with God a deception, inasmuch as it is not the Man at all but the God that raises himself. And it is instructive to see how Hofmann, in his avowals concerning the human development of Jesus, which he opposes to modern research, has actually at every point reached the conception of this ready-made, divine, docetic Jesus.*

* *Erlanger Zeitschrift*, 1865, i. : and my remarks thereon in *Krause's Prot. Kirchenzeitung*, 1865, No. 8.

After all has been said, the two theories which have been built up side by side with the simple record of the birth of Jesus, are neither possessed of tolerable historic credibility, nor any way intellectually tenable. Let us add, in deference to the charge of revolt from ancient Christian views, they are to be explained by prevalent notions of the day, which lay at the disposal of Apostolic and post-Apostolic time, ready-made schemes of ancient, necessary preparations for modern, thought.

At the root of the belief in the birth from a virgin, side by side with the lofty, religiously fresh and everlastingly true intuition: "a human life that towers above the ordinary level is never to be looked on as the fruit of mere human birth but likewise as a deed of God in the world,"—there lay the coarser notion of the day which thought to lay palpable hold as it were on the working of God in the world, under the form of a material and visible suppression of natural laws; whence the miraculous births of Isaac, Joseph, Samson, Samuel, John the Baptist, Anna the mother of Mary, of some of which we have already spoken: and along with the beautiful and unimpeachable view of Jewish theology that the Holy Ghost associated himself with the wedlock of the pious, and consecrated the fruits of marriage children of God,—we have the sentence of the apocryphal Gospel, "if God closes the womb, he does it in order more wonderfully to open it again, and to show that that which is born springs not from human lust, but is of God's free gift."* How strongly was such a view favoured in the second place by the widespread fancy of the day concerning the impurity of marriage, and of birth, the holiness of celibacy,

* Cf. Gen. xvii. 17. xviii. 11 ff. xxix. 31. xxx. 1-2, 22. Rom. iv. 19 ff. Judges xiii. 2 ff. 1 Sam. i. 2 ff. Luke i. 7 ff. Anna Ev. de nativ. Mar. Ch. i.—iv. Book of Zohar: qui se sanctificant, sicuti generant filium, habitat spiritus sanctus super illos; nam omnes sancti exeunt ab eo et nominantur filii Dei. Ev. de nativ. Mar. Ch. iii. Cum alicujus uterum claudit, ad hoc facit, ut mirabilius denno aperiat et non libidinis esse quod nascitur sed divini muneris cognoscatur: with reference to Sarah and Rachel.

and of virginity, as it meets us in the Old Testament Apocrypha, among the Essenes, in the pages of Philo the Alexandrian, and yet again even in Christianity if not with Jesus, yet certainly with Paul, in the Revelation of John, and still later among the Alexandrians of the second and third centuries.* Finally this view found at once the seal of its justification and the form of its conception in the divine prophecy of the Messiah, who had actually appeared in the person of none other than Jesus.

The Prophet Isaiah, to whom the first Gospel expressly appeals, declared to King Ahaz of Judæa in face of the threatening approach of the kings of Syria and Israel, a divine token of deliverance: a virgin should bare a son, and call his name Immanuel, God with us; before he grew to boyhood the land should be delivered; the foe swallowed up by Assyria. This prophecy was indeed confined in its immediate scope to the time of the prophet, the "young woman" was according to the whole context "a young wife," and was understood as such by the great majority of ancient interpreters in accordance with the linguistic usage of the Hebrew word itself, and the context further shows her to have been the prophet's own wife, who bare him a son: still the description was mysterious: immediately afterwards comes the mention of a branch on the seat of David designated by those loftiest appellations which comprehended all Israel's Ideals; and the Greek version of Alexandria at any rate called the mother a virgin.† What

* Cf. above Vol. I. pp. 282. 366. Matt. xix. 12. 1 Cor. vii. 1. Rev. xiv. 4. Again, Ev. d. nativ. Mar. iv.: ab omni immundo abstinebit, virum nunquam cognoscet, sed sola sine exemplo sine macula, sine corruptione, sine virili commixtione virgo filium generabit.

† Isa. vii. 14 ff. viii. 2 ff. ix. 6 f. Cf. Mic. v. 2. Matt. i. 22 f. The Hebrew word is *almah*, as distinguished from *betulah*, according to the context often the young wife. The translators Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion gave in Isa. vii. 14 throughout *νεάνις*, and the Ebionites, nay the Jews generally, Just. Tryph. 71. Philos. 9, 30. Ir. 3, 21, 5. Eus. 5, 8 followed them amid the loud reproaches of Irenæus, who indeed loc. cit. even laughed to scorn Acts ii. 30. The Alex. translation has incorrectly *παρθένος*. Even Oehler A. Messias in Herzog 9, 414 f. no longer espouses the old view. As to the finds of Lange, see above Vol. I. p. 319.

was more natural than here to look for the coming Messiah, and to clothe the actual Messiah, Jesus, with the portraiture there given, especially when there were not wanting elsewhere prophetic passages in which (*e.g.* in Micah) a mysterious coming into being was announced for the Messiah. Although the miraculous birth of the Messiah was no dogma of the Jews, or if it were, yet only in quite late times, and in disputed form, and although the above-named explanation of the prophetic passage was even later by no means the usual one, yet what was to hinder the subtle trifling of those Jewish Christians, whose ransacking of the Old Testament is sufficiently exemplified in the first Gospel, from thinking soon enough of such a passage in one place or another? with what happy success is seen from the fact that the redactor of Matthew, the writer on whom Luke relies, and finally Luke himself vie with each other in seizing on the new tradition.*

As the opinion of the virgin-birth hung together with popular Jewish views, so did the doctrine of pre-existence with the sublimest Jewish speculations of the age. On the ground of older ideas, partly embodied already in the Old Testament, of an everlasting Word, a Wisdom of God, the Eternal sharer of His throne, a heavenly and altogether God-like man, a Messiah created somehow or other before the world, though it were only in the divine foreknowledge, the Alexandrine philosophy, and notably Philo, its most typical representative, had attempted to resolve the contrast between God and Matter into

* Of a miraculous birth of the Messiah the older writings of the Jews, and even Jewish expectations at the time of Jesus (*cf.* the Gospels and even John vii. 42) afford not a trace. As late as the time of Justin Martyr (middle of 2nd century) the Messiah is for the Jews *ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων*, Tryph. 49. On the other hand the later Rabbis: *corpus Messiae a semine hominum non producendum appellatur substantia nova et forma divina sancta (nezah Israel)*. Gloss. ad beresh. rabb.: *redemptor sine patre erit*. Zech. vi. 12. And beresh. ketanna ad Gen. xxxviii. 1: *Deus erat procreans carnem regis Messiae, sicut dictum est (Isa. lxvi. 7); antequam parturiret peperit*. Remarkable here is the employment of another passage in Isaiah. Bertholdt, Christol. Jud. p. 91 f.

the unity of the Divine Word as a middle term of Being.* Philo's theories concerning the Eternal Divine Word, the only Begotten, the Creator of the World, and the daringly idealistic yet still Old Testament identification with this Word, of a perfect, spiritual, and heavenly man, are simply reproduced with literal exactness in the writings of John and Paul.

True there was this great difference, that while Philo had projected worlds of thought in order to bridge over the gaps that yawned between God and the world, and to compass that God who far from reach was still the object of desire; the Christians, in place of a conception that smiled at their efforts and cruelly eluded their grasp, found the bodily incarnation of the Man who brought the godlike, the ideal life; but when they tried to think of him, whose influence they felt, they were unable to think of him, save under Philonic formulæ. They thought of him as belonging to the yonder side, yet dwelling on the godless hitherside of man's experience, as the incarnation of a transcendental existence of personal power and life. They perpetuated the severance, whose end they proclaimed, and left it to the Christianity of the future to conceive of the felt presence of God in Christ as a revelation of God, to whose essence it belongs, (without the artificial mediation of inferior beings, most of all too without the thin ghostly spectres of impersonal Pre-existences, such as some would to this day fain rescue from the general crash, even while they are crashing, nay before they can be said to stand), to whose essence it belongs, we say, to find a home for himself, that is for all that is communicable of his being, in growing fulness of contagious glow in this world and in the spirits of men.†

* Cf. as to the historical presuppositions of Philo's doctrine Lücke's Comm. on John i. 283 f. Doctrines of the existence of the Messiah before the world as a Name in God's presence, as Light, as Word, as Spirit. Hen. 48, 3. Targ. Jon. ad Mic. v. 1. Bertholdt, p. 135 ff. Oehler, 428, 437. Banr, N. T. Theol. p. 216.

† Cf. above the account of Philo, Vol. I. p. 276 ff. Again: Der gesch. Christns, p. 135. On Beyschlag, p. 140 ff. 203 ff. In his Christology of the N. T., 1866,

When after repeated consideration a man has come to think the original straightforward story better than all theories, he may well be tempted, the more disappointed he finds himself here and elsewhere with theory, the more solace he has experienced in the contemplation of simple fact, to meet the impatient urgency of all questions concerning the Whence of such a personality, by evading them altogether.

For our own part it even seems to us that the impartial writing of history requires, that until we have recorded and examined the actual results accomplished, we should put a summary veto on all inquiries into the higher origin of the life in question. On the other hand again, one may be expected, now that the seemingly so short and easy path to the birth of Jesus has led perforce to the criticism of highly wrought conceptions, to make a plain confession, whether we really mean to break at once with all higher conceptions whatsoever. The reader has, moreover, a right to see this wonderful life, so intimately bound up as it is with our own personal interest, placed at least upon such a preliminary footing, as shall leave no doubt at all about the general view of the writer.

Well, our foundation will always be, as here at the outset, that ultimate fact discernible from stronger or weaker indications. The more human, the more deeply embedded in the historic growth of the race these facts discover themselves, the less will they let us doubt. But if there are points in this life, which as for example the moral faultlessness of Jesus, his unsullied sense of God, his sunbright conception of his Fatherhood, his wonders, his resurrection, his boundless self-assertion, which far transcend at once all the attainments and all the

he has unfortunately continued those assertions. Cf. also Dörner in his *Gesch. der Prot. Theol.* 1867, p. 875 ff. Dörner will not subscribe to Beyschlag's attempts but himself gives nothing more tenable, since he ascribes to the Son a peculiar divine mode of being, as his eternal character, yet without immediate share in the divine personality. This is ultimately neither more nor less than that ideal pre-existence in the divine Spirit, which we the rest only express with somewhat less adornment and without talking of hypostases.

consciousness of the soundest and most signally commissioned links in the chain of humanity, and hence at the same time transcend that chain itself, as regards the law of its experience : we confess our inability, to begin with, to call in question inviolable certainties with the levelling arts of a Strauss ; but as little are we able either, though it be at the risk of again laying ourselves fairly open to the charge of having strayed out of history into the old false dogmatism and mysticism at the hands of the most advanced spirits of the age—to refrain from the acknowledgment that in the person of Jesus a higher human organization than heretofore was called into being by that creative will of God, that runs in parallel though viewless course side by side with the processes of creaturely procreation. If it must have a name it can bear no better one than that which Paul found for it at the outset : a new creation in mankind, a consummation, a desensualization, a spiritualization, a deification of the godlike image.

Little as such a name can lift the secrecy that veils the source, it is enough for us to be assured that this human formula is less open to exception than others. It avoids, to begin with, the offensiveness of the coarse or visionary forms of thought above described, retaining at the same time their sound kernel, viz. the notion of an original, new, transcendent consciousness of God, the greatness and depth of which is as little dependent on any absolute breach of fundamental laws of the universe, as it is on an infinitude in time. It also shuns the inconceivabilities of the otherwise far to be preferred humanitarian view. However various the forms in which that view may clothe itself, whether it speaks of the Israelitish virtues of the parental house, or of the cogent power of a pregnant age, or specially and chiefly of the free incalculable operation of Jesus' own spiritual action, in order thus to discover the grounds which might explain his being : and however justifiable these aspects of the matter are, no hypothesis which merely assumes the measure of a common man, will lead us to

an existence which essentially transcends the level of the human series.

But would this view take a higher flight, be it to the acknowledgment of hidden depths of nature in the human race, a generative impulse within, which works at one time with Titanic power, at another with feebler force, or be it to the admission of a God who, however one can explain the limitation to time of his eternal act, is not far from any spiritual formation in the world, then we should be inclined to agree, though still not satisfied.

We have no special desire, as such, to think of the creative action of God, which we conceive of as essentially itself a matter of law and order, as though it were different in kind in the sending of Christ, from that operation of God by which he calls into being the great leaders of every century. For it *will* seem to us to be the same God, who far beyond the boundaries of surrounding circumstance, of age, of general development, brings forth in one place the towering heights of thought, and in another as here, a model unique of its kind, not indeed of the whole territory of life, but of moral and religious perfection. In opposition to those timid ones, who tremble anon lest by such a comparison they should lose the dignity and singleness of Jesus, we should find that dignity sufficiently preserved in the fact that it is the holiest centre of humanity, the real point of union between the spirit of man and of God, in which the perfection of Jesus was built up, and that no progress of ages, though it even overthrow and surpass sublimest worlds of thought, is able to outshine the diamond once set in full pure nobility of a godlike life, and of a godlike mind, as though it were an old curiosity gone dull with years. And still we should not yet do full justice to the greatness of Jesus, unless we distinguished the creative action of God in his person, from every other in point of energy, and so far ultimately in kind as well, as something by itself and special.

All else which we may regard in any way as a deed of God within the lines of humanity has always after all a measured movement of more or less, a mingling of perfection and of deficiency, strength and weakness, of that which excels with that which may be surpassed : sparks thrown by God into the dark earthy formation, drops of the life of God in the broad and troubled river of humanity, no godlike world of light, no godlike sea of life. But here the divine energy, say we rather the divine self-communication, is one that with unbroken might breaks through : it is a whole, full, blameless life, no piecework, no mixture of the lofty and the base ; it is a divine creation in full force of largest love ; for it is the completion of man as man, the issuing of the creation into the being of the Creator, the blest repose of God in the work of his own hands. It is the realized ideal of God in his Creation, and it is more than a creation ; to speak in figures, for of the Highest we can use no other language, a divine formation of his own being's kin and being's like in humanity, a coming of the essential Godhead to men, inasmuch as above and beyond all unlikeness between the divine and human nature rises the higher unity of holy life and inseverable communion in spirit, mind and love, the presage of an ever broadening breach of sundering boundaries, which the eternal God has yet in store, in regions wider than the earth, for his eternities ; yes, for his mankind of the future.* Against this view, which has

* Already the 3rd Ed. of the *Gesch. Christus*, especially the fourth discourse, has given occasion (*Lit. Centralblatt*, 1866) even to Vogel (*Prot. K. Z.*) for accusing me of building up again by such views as these the ancient Alexandrinism which I had just myself demolished. What work above all has M. Nicolas in the *Revue Critique*, 1867, 7, made with these results ! But in point of fact it is only irrefutable inferences from the historical nature of Jesus which I draw, and which only touch earlier views in as far they unshell their kernel of truth. These learned men do but make far too easy with the actual glories of the life of Jesus, above all with his consciousness of sonship : there is left them only the enviable alternative of either creating moral shadows which do not exist (how finely does Nicolas actually bring in a transgression of the command to honour parents !) or to decree that Jesus was a fanatic. My particularizations, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 109 ff., seem to have been flown over by Nicolas in hurricanic haste.

jealously preserved the golden grain of the earliest Christian speculation, while resolutely giving the chaff to the winds, many advocates of the purely humanitarian position will doubtless again and again bare their weapons with eager animation, half pitiful, half indignant. And, strangely enough, they are joined by the straitest believers. Having begun with the cry, that with this view the unique character of Jesus is sacrificed, they add, with Strauss, a mere man never possesses this unique character. We will not put them to the blush by demonstrating that even they believe in a unique humanity, only by the roundabout assumption of its union with a divine Person. In face of these objections we are content with the admitted fact, that history is full of creative initiation, of superiorities, and unattainabilities; of godlike greatness upon every hand. Aristocracy not ochlocracy is the fundamental character of history. Here we have one fact, and there we have the other—viz. that of the life of Jesus bounded at its circumference by the human limitations of his age, in its centre exalted above all.

With these facts before us we may hazard the conclusion that side by side with these creative initiatives, a creative accomplishment has not been wanting in history, and that the tireless wrestling of God after a representation of a perfect, yes, a godlike being, a beloved godlike image in earthly form, and the restless striving of mankind after apprehension of God in the hallowed precincts of their spiritual life, have been crowned with a success worthy of God and humanity, the perfect godlike Man, in the Person of Jesus himself.

But in these last of all questions, considered more in detail in the "Christ of History," let every man think as he will and as he can.* Let us welcome every form of faith, as well that of highest flight as that of soberest measurement, if only it loses not the eye for the greatness of Jesus, and mars not the vision of clear historic truth. One positive result, however,

* Cf. *Gesch. Christus*, Vortrag IV.

I think, may be subscribed by all: even those who most scrupulously question the possibility of perfection in mankind, whether of Jesus, or another: and that is, that no one among men ever attained maturity, in whose person ideal and reality so met, so touched and kissed, as in the lineaments of him, whom the deep presage of the earnest gaze of old and new belief welcomes with joyous acclamation as its Ideal embodied, and in whom the sharpest probing-tool of this painfully shrewd, distrustful, modern age has not been able to discover any serious blemish. Let us then, instead of displaying the littleness that would dim the light of greatness, be glad that it is there, and rejoice that mankind delights in its destiny as there portrayed.

SECOND SECTION.—THE LEGEND OF THE CHILDHOOD.

There is no need to go back to the childhood of Moses, or even to the swaddling clothes of a Cyrus, an Alexander and a Cæsar, in order to find it intelligible that the beginnings of the life of the Lord should have been encircled with the richest garland of legend. Those which in other cases have been wreathed by real admiration, by poetic wantonness, or merely idle curiosity, and worse, by slavish flattery, have here been twined by the hands of a worshipful devotion to the mystery it adored, of fervent love and overflowing thankfulness, in one word, of Religion.

This feature cannot indeed be rudely denied even to the legends of the apocryphal Gospels. For however many a tale may here appear to have sprung from the tickled curiosity that loves to deal in secrets, and out of a fancy for the unaccustomed, unheard of, impossible, yet even in the coarsely painted picture one sees the traits of that Religion which, suffused with sensuous tendencies as it is, still seeks by every token to assure itself with anxious care of the godlike majesty of the Redeemer who has come into the world. That these legends offer little new and accurate history, does not admit of doubt.

Even if we go back to the earliest of them, as we find them in the two Gospels most frequently mentioned, they lose themselves not only in improbabilities, but in serious contradictions. Add to this that the oldest records show no trace of this wonder-world of the Infancy.

The contemporaries of Jesus, so far as they appear in these very Gospels, even Mary, know nothing of any mysterious childhood and youth, Paul the Apostle is simply acquainted with modest up-growth under laws of house and nation; Peter in Acts speaks only of the deeds of the Man. Jesus himself arrogates no other position in his own discourses; nowhere does he go back to secrets and wonders of his youth and childhood, nowhere does he appeal in answer to the calumny of foes to any other greatness than that which God and His Spirit make for the Man in his discourse and action.* Besides, this, two Gospels in their account have overleapt the entire infancy and youth, and if one reckons in addition the original document of Matthew, the majority of the Gospels even is against the stories of the childhood. In a certain sense then this, legends belong more to the history of Christianity than to that of Jesus. Only we cannot quite pass them by, because whether we will or no, they meet us in our documents in the form of history, and because they are in a manner, after all, an ancient precipitate of those sentiments, with which the historical appearance of Jesus has been greeted by mankind from the first, and is greeted even to this day.

The legend of the infancy has developed itself in three main directions. It pictures the omens and the birth. It exhibits the various welcomes which hailed the new-born child. It gives an account of the wonderful rescue of this child of God. The Gospels of Matthew and of Luke have as it were divided these communications with one another. In Luke they have swelled to an abundant stream. In Matthew

* Cf. Matt. ix. 3 ff. xi. 27. xii. 28. xxii. 41 ff. xxviii. 18. Mary knows of no miracles, xii. 46 ff. xiii. 57.

the legendary garb is somewhat more spare in measurement, yet he alone has the third piece of it, the wonderful rescue. The apocryphal Gospels have further extended the accounts in every direction in their own well known materializing manner.

1. The birth from a virgin is related by the two Gospels and by the later apocryphal ones with great minuteness of detail. A series of omens precede the birth itself. Comparatively speaking, the account of Matthew is the simplest. Mary the betrothed of Joseph is found with child in an incomprehensible manner. Joseph is shocked, but equitably minded as he is, refrains from prostituting the guilty one by noising her crime abroad by letter of divorce or, worse, by public prosecution for adultery, but seeks privately to put her away. Then there appears to him an angel in a dream by night, expounds to him, the son of David, the holy mystery; demands the consummation of the marriage, announces the Son, and assigns him his name. Joseph straightway takes Mary as spouse into his house, but touches her not until the birth of her first-born, whom he calls Jesus.* After all, this form of the story had a good many things against it, especially the occurrence of the Conception without any announcement from heaven, without any knowledge among men, without the knowledge of Mary herself; the insignificant position held by the real mother in presence of the mere foster-father, the appearance of evil, the grave suspicion; the domestic union of Joseph and Mary long before the birth. It was natural enough that other versions should be formed, shaping with still greater delicacy the lofty dignity of the event. Accordingly with Luke, although he can scarcely have had Matthew in his eye, the Annunciation precedes the Conception, and it is Mary, who is its recipient.† An angel appears to her, announces Jesus to

* Matt. i. 18-25. The word "just," ver. 19, plainly derives its meaning from what follows. The firstborn in ver. 25 is certainly a later importation from Luke ii. 7. Cf. Luke i. 26 ff.

† Against all evidence is Scheckenburger's theory, *Urspr. des 1. Ev.* p. 69 ff. and Bleek, *Synopsis*, 1, 136 f. that Luke gives the more original, Matthew the

her as to one highly favoured by God, Jesus the Son of the Highest, the eternal King of the people, seated on the throne of David; and declares to the pure maiden's astonishment the mystery of the Spirit's approach, and of the wonder begun already in another place in the person of her kinswoman Elizabeth, wife of a priest among the mountains of Juda.* She accepts the message as the handmaid of the Lord; and it nears fulfilment. Upon her hurried journey to her kinswoman, Elizabeth and the son of her womb, John the forerunner, hail the mother of the Messiah: the great ones of Israel yet unborn, grow up for each other in the sacred intercourse of their respective mothers, and on her return Mary welcomes the long expected advent of the new comer whom she folds in her arms, after a birth which takes place in all due form in the presence of Joseph the betrothed, who, as disposed by God, accompanies her from Nazara to Bethlehem, into the land of Juda once more,—although, so says the Ebionite source, she can only prepare him a bed in the manger of the hostelry stable.†

Full of beauty are these supplementary additions which the industry of Luke has gathered together.

Yet even the supplement makes no history: and most erroneous is the delusion, that we may put together the full-orbed truth piecemeal from the two authors by just simply arranging them in due sequence.

It is true one would in this way have a graduated scale of preparation for the sacred birth: Annunciation to Mary, Annunciation in the priest's house, Annunciation to Joseph. But who does not see that Matthew neither knows nor admits

more recent account. The critical Introduction has shown indeed that Luke's use of the (later) opening history of Matthew is not certainly demonstrable, or is at most probable. That does not exclude a view of Luke's opening history as a finer modification relatively to an earlier, coarser, more Matthew-like representation.

* Details in the history of John.

† It is observed, in opposition to the accounts of the Apocrypha, that in Luke a birth with all that it brings in its train is presupposed: hence Mary's purification. The Church, it is true, rejoins: non obligabatur. Hofmann, 121.

the annunciations of Luke? He knows them not; for he does not hint with one word at any revelation to Mary preceding the appearance of the angel to Joseph, as though it had been the subject of his incredulous doubt; rather does he designate the condition of Mary and the discovery of that condition, not as if it were Joseph's discovery alone, but as simply the first fact from which the story starts, unexplained to Joseph and Mary, who were totally unprepared for its occurrence.

He does not admit them. For surely it were a miracle, if Mary, a previous revelation vouchsafed her, had not made Joseph privy to her secret, or if Joseph had not believed Mary's account and the evidence of the priest's house, and by reason of his doubts, distrust, and thoughts of separation, should have challenged a fresh angelic appearance, a fresh word from heaven, which word after all contains no blame nor chiding of his unbelief. These huge contradictions in occurrences so stupendous that their remembrance could not vacillate, are the token, not of history, but of legend.

Contradictions are not wanting in minor matters of detail, in the description of the dwelling-place, the birth-place, and the time when wedlock united the pair beneath one roof. Along with the contradictions we meet with difficulties and inconceivabilities, now in one writer, now in both. Of the birth from a virgin as such we will speak no longer. But regarding the angelic appearances on the whole, so often only the poetic investiture for the higher steps in the world's history,—or the visions in dreams by night, this current belief of antiquity, or the somewhat grossly Jewish form of the Messianic announcements, or observing the wonders without end in the priest's house, the embryonic greetings, the assurance of the future awaiting them displayed by the women, who have so completely become the leaders in the chorus of Christian posterity, after all this we shall soon still the doubt as to whether we are here in the realm of history or of pious legend.

But these two detailed accounts of the birth from a virgin

were not enough by a long way for the later Apocryphal Gospels; they wanted more eye-witness, more sensuously supersensuous facts, wonders that sparkled, a Mary purer than the pure. We left the youthful Mary as foster-child of the Temple at Jerusalem.

Now approaches the twelfth or fourteenth year, in which maidens in the East are marriageable, and temple virgins are dismissed to their homes by the rigid purity of Pharisaic principles, if on no other grounds.* It is resolved to find a husband for her, or at least a guardian until she marry. Indeed, according to several accounts, the High Priest (in the Gospel of James it is Zacharia, Elizabeth's husband) calls in the divine interference, after Mary has, early enough, vowed perpetual virginity, and refused the hand of the High Priest's son, Abiathar. (Mark ii. 26.)† All the unmarried men, or at least, all the ancients and widowers of the whole land, or according to others only those of the tribe of Juda, or again of the house of David, are called together.

According to the History of Joseph the decision is given by lot, according to most accounts by a miraculous sign, in favour of Joseph. The rod which in obedience to a command of God he bore to the altar, put forth a blossom (Numbers xvii. 1, seq., Isaiah xi. 1), on the top of which the Spirit of God rested like a dove (Matthew iii. 16). Joseph was a grey-haired widower, eighty, or as his own life history tells us, ninety years of age.‡ In vain he proved recalcitrant in dread of ridicule; at last he made up his mind to take her into his house as her guardian and foster-father, until perhaps one of his sons should wed her. Accordingly a guard of honour was assigned her until her

* Of the 12th year mention is made, Jacob. Ch. viii. Hist. Jos. iii. of the 14th Ev. Nativ. Mar. vii. Matt. viii. The fear of polluting the temple in all Gospels, cf. Matt. viii. Puberty beginning as early as 7th-9th year, Winer, Reingkeit. Wives of eleven years to this day in Tiberias. Burckh. 570.

† The guardian, Hist. Joseph iii. Matt. viii. God's decision, Jac. viii. The vow, Matt. vii. 8. Ev. Nat. Mar. vii.

‡ Hist. Jos. iv. 14. Fabric. Cod. Apocr. I. 31. Aug. Cons Ev. ii. 1.

marriage with Joseph, which the High Priest would not hear of his foregoing, consisting of from five to seven maidens.* (True, according to another account in the Gospel of the Birth of Mary, she returned in the meantime, after the ceremony of betrothal with Joseph, accompanied by these maidens to her parents' house in Galilee.†)

While Joseph was at this time constantly absent from home, whether in pursuit of his calling abroad by the lake of Galilee at Capernaum, as most accounts will have it, or in furnishing the house at Bethlehem in preparation for the wedding, as the Gospel of the Birth of Mary informs us, the wonders of God began.‡ Mary had spent some two years (others say but a few days) in Joseph's house, busy with the education of Joseph's orphans, and with weaving purple for a curtain for God's temple, and meanwhile had entered on her fifteenth or sixteenth year, when she experienced the unheard-of marvel.§ The first dark message of the angel Gabriel she received as she was drawing water by the well of Nazara, which is still hallowed by tradition; the more explicit one three days afterwards in the house while weaving purple.|| A Conception by means of the Eternal Word of Reason was promised her, and in the Gospel of the Birth of Mary her misgivings are thus laid to rest: "As pure maid without man, without sin shalt thou conceive, as pure maid bear, as pure maid suckle."¶ Jesus the Incarnate himself, makes, in the History of Joseph, this strange declaration, that he loved her of the free motion of his will in agreement

* Matt. viii. Jac. ix. The virgins (7) Hist. Nat. Mar. viii.

† Ev. Nat. Mar. viii.

‡ Jac. ix. Matt. x. Hist. Jos. iv. v. Ev. Nat. Mar. viii.

§ Pregnancy in 16th year, Jac. xii. Birth in 15th, Jos. xiv. Short stay in Galilee, from 14th year, Matt. ix. Nativ. Mar. ix. Weavers of curtains for Temple (paid from Temple treasury) are elsewhere also mentioned, cf. Grätz 3. 124.

|| Jac. xi. xii. Matt. ix.

¶ Ch. ix.: ne existimes, Maria, quod humano more concipias: nam sine virili commixtione virgo concipies, virgo paries, virgo nutries; spir. enim s. superveniet in te et virtus altissimi obumbrabit tibi contra omnes ardores libidinis, &c. Cf. Conception through the ear. Hofmann p. 77

with the Father and the Spirit, and took flesh of her substance in a manner which no creature could understand * Now, however, Joseph appears in the fourth, fifth, or even the ninth month !† He weeps, complains, laments, dreads High Priest and Law ; but dreads too the impeachment of Mary, lest she, haply blessed by an angel, must shed forth her guiltless blood. Mary herself denies all contamination, without making mention of the angel ; the maidens protest the innocence of her, who day by day was angel-visited, was angel-fed. They can only guess it was God's angel.‡ But the angel of God himself now undertakes the instruction of Joseph, in the apparition with which most of us are familiar, by night, or even at midday ; and Joseph begs Mary's pardon for the wrong he did her.§ But these voices from heaven, of which also the elder Gospels tell, are not enough.

In Jerusalem tidings are received of Mary's state. She is summoned to the bar before all Israel along with Joseph. Under the reproaches of the High Priest, whom no protestations can soften, the accused are dissolved in tears.

In conformity with Numbers v. 14, she must drink the Water of Cursing, the Water of Conviction. Joseph first drank the draught of the Lord at the altar ; seven times round the altar did he walk, and God gave no sign of guilt upon his countenance. Then Mary drank also. The High Priest forbore to condemn, if God would not judge ; the people kissed Mary and craved forgiveness.|| The birth in Bethlehem brought new signs.

Most accounts, following Luke, bring in the journey from Galilee to Bethlehem by means of an incidental emergency (the Decree of Taxation by the Emperor Augustus) ; on the

* Ch. v.

† Jos. v. and Ev. Nat. Mar. x. (4th month). Jac. xiii. (6), Matt. x. (9th month).

‡ Jac. xiii. xiv. Matt. x. xi.

§ Angel by night, *e.g.* Jac. xiv. Matt. xi. At noon, Jos. vi. Begging pardon, Matt. xi.

Jac. xv. xvi. Matt. xii.

other hand the Gospel of the Birth of Mary makes the couple, who after the angelic apparition to Joseph are wedded, betake themselves, in the beginning of the decisive month, to Joseph's house in Bethlehem, now ready for their reception.* Joseph saddles the ass for the journey, sets Mary thereon, one of the sons who accompany them leads the beast, Joseph follows behind. Three miles from Bethlehem Mary sees a vision; she is sad, and yet laughs, for she sees a sorrowful and a jubilant people, Jews and Heathen, as the angel tells her. A mile and a half from Bethlehem, in the midst of lonely desolation, the pangs come upon her; Joseph leads her to a cave; according to the later Matthew it is an angel, who, with a more than human range of supervision, orders the halt. Joseph seeks for midwives: by the time he comes Mary has brought forth painlessly. Two midwives come. Zelomi examines Mary's body; she cries astounded, "A virgin she has conceived, a virgin she has brought forth, a virgin she has remained,"† Salome, in doubt, wishes also to examine further, but with a shriek she withdraws her hand, burnt and withered. Thus Matthew. According to James, the first midwife believed the radiant prodigy without touching; only Salome had said, like Thomas, "Except I lay my finger there, and investigate her nature, I will not believe that she has brought forth as a virgin."

An angel of the Lord stilled the pain of the penitent, she touched the child, or indeed, carried it, and was made whole.‡

Finer feeling will be on its guard against representations of the holiest history, which for illustrations of so lofty a subject, have recourse to expedients so gross as the devices of midwives; but one cannot but feel quite sad to observe how this

* Ch. x.

† Matt. xiii.: nunquam hoc auditum est, ut mamillæ cujusquam plenæ sint lacte et natus masculus matrem suam virginem ostendat. Sed et nulla sanguinis pollutio facta est in nascente, nullus dolor in parturiente. Virgo concepit, virgo peperit et virgo permansit.

‡ Jac. xvii.-xx. Matt xiii.

sensualization of the highest truth from the outset down to the last stragglers has acted as a regular provocative of coarse, profane and vulgar views. From the manipulations of the Apocrypha, and the doubts of Salome, it is but a step to the parody of virgin-birth. Hostile Judæism and heathendom accomplished this consummation. In the Acts of Pilate Annas and Caiaphas stand up at the head of the people, in Pilate's presence, with the accusation that Jesus is derived from the sinful intercourse of Joseph and Mary.* In the Talmudic Gemara (Sanhedrim tractate) Mary, the curler of women's locks, is unfaithful to her husband Stadas; she has an intrigue with Panderas Pappus, the son of Judas: the fruit is Jesus.† Quite a similar tale is told as early as the second century by the Jew who appears in the work of the heathen Celsus (177 A.D.), of Pantheras the soldier, and of the repudiation of the sempstress by the betrothed and deceived Carpenter.‡ Another somewhat more favourable tradition as far as Mary is concerned, is found in the mediæval book of Jewish lies, Toldoth Jeshua, (Origin of Jesus): a young soldier, Joseph Panderas, seduces the virgin Mirjam or Maria, the hairdresser, who is betrothed by her mother, a widow, to the unimpeachable young man Juchanan (John). Mirjam takes Panderas for

* Act. Pil. Ch. ii.

† Ch. vii. cf. Hier. Schabb. ch. 14. פנתירא, פנדירא (Cels. Πανθήρα)=פנדררה flagellum, Winer, Art. Joseph. Cf. Lightfoot, 261. Ammon, Leben Jesu I., 130 ff., Hase, p. 17. Rich. v. d. Alm, die Urtheile heidn. u. jüd. Schriftst. der 4 erst. chr. Jahrh. ü. Jes. &c. 1864. Also above, Vol. I. p. 27 ff. On the meaning of the names vid. Hitzig's acute explan. ben Pandera and ben Stada in Hilg. Z. 1865, 344-347. Strauss already had derived Pandera from the genealogies (Athenäum, 1839, Feb. p. 15 ff.)=πενθερός (Jos. in rel. to Heli, thought of as Mary's father,=son-in-law); Pappus (פפוס, Πάππος): Heli or Jacob's Grandfather, mother's father, supposing search was made in the list of Jos. mat. pedigree. Hitzig approves these interpretations and adds the expl. of Celsus' σπαριώτης and of Stada (סטאדא): Panthera=Roman=Soldier: Stada=sta! da!=who goes there? With the Jews in general Stada is the name of a woman=declinavit ista (a marito). I content myself with citing these at all events ingenious interpretations. The name Pappos and Papa occurs, however, elsewhere. Cf. B. J. i. 17. 5 ff. Ant. 14, 15, 12 ff. Rabbi Papa in Herzfeld 2. 394.

‡ Orig. c. Celsum, 1. 28.

her betrothed, conceives, and on disclosing her condition, is cast off by her lover.*

Let us, to crown all, listen to the poisonous low ribaldry of a Celsus at the expense of our Gospels. Could God then, he sneers, haply burn with amorous desire? Was the mother of Jesus fair? Was it even consistent with divine propriety to fall in love with a dowerless damsel, unknown to her next neighbours? A story fit to be placed side by side with tales of Danae, Melanippe, Auge, and Antiope!†

Very feeble sounds in reply the Christian defence in the Acts of Pilate; even when the most pious men of Israel stand up before the Procurators, and solemnly protest that Joseph and Mary were betrothed, and that they were present at the ceremony.

But ancient aberrations, on the ground of pretended facts, are far outbid by those of modern times. In wild romantic form, Venturini, at the beginning of this century, the author of the Natural Account of the great Prophet of Nazareth, has made a recast of these impurities with the faith of a Paulus in literal, but natural, history.

On the early death of her parents, Mary had imbibed in the house of Elizabeth, through intercourse with the Priest Zacharias, enthusiastic hopes of the future, even the wish to be the mother of the Messiah. She is betrothed on the day of Pentecost to the venerable Joseph, a man well stricken in years, the friend of her father's house, the tender guardian of her earliest youth, all the more willingly because he, like herself, is descended from the house of David. The day before the wedding she passes in breathless suspense in Nazara, the house of Clopas. A storm comes up; she dreams; the door is suddenly opened; a shining form steps in; the Annunciation breaks the heart of maidenhood; she cries inspired: God do unto me all according to his holy will. She wakes from her ecstasy: by her side now stands Joseph, whose

* Cf. Vol. I. p. 28.

† c. Cels. 37, 39.

eye she is ashamed to meet. Slowly, by means of later *rencontres*, the dark and bitter secret is unveiled. The person in disguise was a young Rabbi, a member of the High Council, a scholar of Shammai, and an Essene besides, known in Jerusalem as a strange eccentric character, a seer of visions, glowing for Israel's future, a denouncer of the people's sins, which hinder the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy, none other than a second Joseph, who appears in the Gospels as Joseph of Arimathea, who is afterwards found regarding with the gaze of a penitent and with tearful eye the young woman and the golden boy; but to the last remains the true friend and counsellor of Jesus.* A still younger absurdity has represented the birth of Jesus as a plot of the Pharisees to overthrow the power of King Herod, an ingenious device for producing the Child-Messiah, by a union of the fair youth Carus with Mary the daughter of David.†

2. Solemn greetings surround the New-born, so surely as his birth is the wonder of all wonders. Most sparing, first, are the treasures which the writer of Matthew's introductory narrative discloses. For him it is enough to narrate the birth from a virgin, as such, and the birth in Bethlehem, and lay his finger significantly upon the Old Testament. Not till the child is two years old do messengers come to worship from the east. Luke and his Ebionite authority have provided more extensive scenery for the birth itself and the weeks immediately succeeding, there—signs in heaven and on earth; here—as though to supplement the heathen homage—a pious tribute on the part of the Jewish Jerusalem. The Apocrypha have added a few touches of yet coarser colour, not altogether without address.

In mighty and suggestive contrast to the darkness of the night, on which the birth of Jesus falls, to the wretched

* Venturini, 1st Ed. Bethlehem (Copenhagen), 1800-1802. 2. 1806 1, 112 ff. 165 f. 247 ff. 352.

† The Natural Birth of Jesus of Nazareth. Neustadt an der Orla, 1830. On the opposite side: Anticarus, Leipzig, 1831. Cf. Ammon, Fortbildung 2. Ed. 1, 307.

housing of the poor pilgrims, who journey from Nazara to Bethlehem, who from the inn take refuge in the stable and the manger, in order barely to find a place in the world for the newborn babe, yes to crown all—in contrast to the grief of Israel, that in these days of taxing by the Emperor Augustus in Jerusalem and in Bethlehem with bleeding heart enrolls itself in the Roman register, Luke's Ebionite informant has to tell of blinding glory from heaven, of a watch both human and angelic which welcomes the new comer with warmth and solemnity combined.* An angel of the Lord appears. In Bethlehem he arouses none from slumber it is true: but he makes his way to the shepherds, to the genuine, pious, peaceable children of the people, and at the same time the purest posterity of David the shepherd boy,—who as types of the Great Shepherd keep watch over their flocks outside Bethlehem; and declares to them instead of fear, great joy for the whole people, “for unto you this day is born in the city of David a Saviour, Christ the Lord.” And while he names to them the sure sign—a child in swaddling clothes lying in a manger in Bethlehem, a heavenly host surrounds him rejoicing in the deed of God, congratulating these representatives of humanity on the gracious advent, “Glory be to God in the heights and welfare upon earth to men in whom he is well pleased.” The heavens retired from view, the shepherds hastened, sought and saw the child: Mary heard, and the angel voices still sounded in her heart.†

* Whether Luke in the birth of Jesus at the time of the taxing by the Emperor Augustus would present an idea side by side with the chronolog. and local interest, by which he was led, is matter of dispute. From the first such an idea has been sought, now the expression of Israel's servitude and that of Jesus himself (Ebrard, Hofmann), now that of Jesus' significance for the world (Greek fathers, Wieseler). Meyer, *Comm. zu Luk. ii. 2* has called these fictions. But the opening history itself might give occasion to such interpretations, since it speaks partly of redemption from the oppression of the rulers, partly of Jesus' destiny with regard to the whole world. Besides, Luke is elsewhere full of ideal allusions.

† Luke ii. 1-20. *κατάλυμα* by the context, scarcely lodging absolutely, as at the house of a friend, but tavern lodging where no consideration is met with. *φάτνη*, crib, not stall. In the angel's song the surest and best reading even as regards the

In conformity with the Law, eight days after birth the circumcision, and at the same time the naming of the child, took place; five or six weeks after the birth the offering of purification for the mother, and the presentation and redemption of the child in the Temple at Jerusalem. For the birth, which in case of boys was supposed to make the woman unclean for seven days, and kept her forty days at home, a dove was brought by the poorer people as a burnt-offering, and a second as a sin offering; for the redemption of the first-born, if a boy, from the service of God, which fell to the Levites,—five shekels (about twenty francs) were given.

The bringing of these offerings might stand over in the case of dwellers at a distance until the visit to the Feast; but Jerusalem lay quite near Bethlehem, a two hours' walk.* Luke indicates the performance of these traditionary observances, doubtless rather because he takes them for granted, than because he has any exact information: hence it comes too that he confuses them, misses the true aspect of the offering of purification, which has no interest for him; and brings the whole observance at Jerusalem under the head of a Presentation before God, entirely overlooking the redemption.† But with this presentation of Jesus for the service of God, in which he sees summed the whole destiny of the former, the sublimest Jerusalemic recognitions of his dignity are bound up in his eyes, the hailing of the new servant of God by the piously expectant Israel.

Here stood in the Temple the greyhaired Symeon: the Spirit which had foretold him he should not die till he had seen the

facts: *ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας*. Otherwise (*ἐν ᾧ εὐδοκία*) there are three members in the sentence, only one for God, two for man, and these moreover opposed to each other without real antithesis.

* Lev. xii. 1 ff. Num. viii. 14 ff. xviii. 15 f. Ex. xiii. 2. xxii. 28. Cf. Winer, *Erstgeburt*. Bleek, 1, 84, considers the custom, or at least the large amount, as antiquated. On the time of purification (double in case of girls 146+6), Winer, *Reinigkeit*. Putting off the offering of purification, Lightf. 288.

† Luke ii. 21 ff.

means of God's salvation, had driven him hither this day. At once he knew the Child, took it in his arms, and was willing now to die in peace after that the eyes of the servant had seen the Light of the Heathen, the Glory of Israel; but he announced also to the mother the destiny of the child, how it was to be the sign spoken against for health and for falling in Israel, and by reason of distress and persecution to be as a broad sword that should harrow her own heart. At this point, again, the child was taken up by a daily guest of the Temple, the praying and fasting widow Anna, eighty-four years of age; the prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, a Galilæan fellow countrywoman of the tribe of Asher: she thanked God: and prophesying the lightning speed of fulfilment, no longer the dull delay of the promise, she uttered the name of the Deliverer for whom Jerusalem was thirsting, and who was already come.*

To the cry of welcome uttered by Symeon the Israelite of widest world-embracing heart, at whose mouth the bitter earnest of Israel's simultaneous entrance on universal empire receives its soothing consecration, comes as though summoned by the call the festal greeting which Eastern heathendom sends about two years after the birth of Jesus.

The home of those "Magi of the rising sun," who inquire in Jerusalem for the new-born king of the Jews, is not quite clear. The name Magi would point to the priestly castes of Media, Persia, and Babylonia: but in the Græco-roman period, all priests, sorcerers, and jugglers of Asia were summarily described as Magi, and the gifts they bring with them remind one most of all of Arabia, which moreover was pre-eminently the East of the Jews. The earliest Fathers too speak of Arabians; and, though certainly only for the sake of a passage in Isaiah, Justin had Arabians from Damascus in his mind.† About two

* Luke ii. 25-38. Ev. Jac. xxiv.

† Justin. Tryph. 77 f. 88 f. 102 f. 106: οἱ ἀπὸ Ἀραβίας μάγοι. Tert. adv. Marc. iii. 13, adv. Jud. ix. Magi Arabiæ, cf. Plin. H. N. 30, 1. Persia is in Chrysostom's mind, Hom. 7 in Matt. Cf. Hofmann, *Leben Jesu nach den kryphen*, p. 126 f.

years before, so they say in Jerusalem, they have seen the star of a new-born king of the Jews and now would fain see himself.* Herod the king hears of their intention, he assembles the whole hierarchy, the Synedrion, in order to inquire of the birth place of the Messiah, and with one accord Bethlehem is pointed out to him on the strength of the Prophet Micah (v. 1). The Magi have now something to guide them; to which a second indication is soon added: while they set out for Bethlehem, the star which they had long no more beheld, goes before them, and remains stationary above the house where the child is with its mother. They fall in worship on their knees, and open their treasures offering him gold and frankincense and myrrh, and then, their yearning stilled, return home, though not by way of Jerusalem, which a vision by night forbade them to enter on account of the wiles of Herod.†

The eternal right of these beautiful legends, in companionship with which our childhood had its happy growth, far be it from us to assail. They are the prophetic dawn of a great day of heavenly glory, and world-compelling might, but also in the darker fringe that borders them, signs too of tragic struggles, sanguinary pangs, which from the home of Jesus permeate the world. But ideal history has itself no obstinate desire to be true history. No doubt some things did actually happen pretty much as the recital takes for granted, the circumcision, the offering of purification: although this, according to the custom of the people, may have taken place otherwise and later than is related, with Galilee for starting point, and by proxy; while, apart from that, the presentation in the Temple, especially for those from a distance, had fallen into disuse. Even the region of dim surmise represented in the persons of a Symeon and an Anna, even the yearning of

* The time of the star's appearance comes out clearly from Matt. ii. 2, 7. On the other hand, the birth of Jesus, which was marked by the star, might according to Herod's astute reckoning lie somewhat later. According to Abarbanel the conjunction preceded the birth of Moses by three years.

† Matt. ii. 1-12.

heathendom after God's salvation, we would not, as such, invade with blank denial. But, regarding the matter as a whole, the oldest accounts prevent us from thinking of great signs and wonders in the infancy of him, who in his manhood makes for himself and by himself alone his independent way. Without reminding the reader anew of the voices of the people with regard to the youth of Jesus, of Mary, of Paul, of the silence of Matthew concerning angels on the night of birth, and prophetic greetings in the Temple, we always find that one sign destroys the other by making it superfluous.* If Bethlehem was informed by angel hosts upon the birthday, if the stupendous news was spread so zealously by shepherds' mouths, as reported, the neighbouring Jerusalem must have been already in commotion, and in that case there was no need for Symeon and Anna first to spread the news, the Holy City to be first excited at the intelligence brought by the Magi, for the Synedrion to hold its session, for Herod to waylay both town and house with schemes of tyrannic torture. Then let us examine the details; angel hosts singing, one common song in every mouth, and returning again to heaven, are surely mere drapery. Shepherds who on receipt of a vague token find out in the dead of night, in a town consisting of numerous houses, the one right house out of many, are surely but ideal forms.

The clear spiritual vision of an Anna, a Symeon, which straightway beholds in the child the Messiah: the Messiah too both of Jews and Gentiles, yes, of Gentiles more than of Jews; the Messiah who should bring not only succour but also endure painful conflict; in defiance of all order puts to shame and bursts the bounds of that long and weary way by which the noblest of Israel, a John, the spiritual leader of his people, the Apostles, Jesus in fine himself, at length, in the noonday of his life, and not before, arrived at the belief in His Messiahship, and the

* It is not a bad precaution which is taken in Ev. Jac. xx.: Σαλώμη (the midwife), μὴ ἀναγγεῖλῃς ὅσα εἶδες παράδοξα, ἕως οὗ εἰσιέλθῃ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ὁ παῖς.

tragic consciousness of a breach and a rupture with their nation, which turned their eye towards heathendom. And these unknown, unverifiable names, which thus outstrip the whole age, Symeon, Anna, Phanuel, have they not their whole significance simply in themselves, in the very names, "Hearing of Prayer," "Grace," "Countenance of God" ?*

Still the Magi are left. One may admit as credible the assertion that the Jewish expectations of the Messiah, which early enough went the round even of the West, penetrated still earlier into the East by means of the numerous Jews who were scattered about Babylonia, one may admit too, in deference to a Portuguese Rabbi of the 15th century, Abarbanel, in his commentary on Daniel, that the sign of the Fishes belongs to the Jews, and the conjunction of the planets Saturn and Jupiter in the sign of the Fishes indicated the birth of Moses, and was to indicate that of the Messiah. Yes, one may believe the astronomer Kepler, my illustrious countryman, when he maintains that the conjunction of Jupiter, Saturn and Mars in the sign of Pisces observed by him since 17th December, 1603, near the Ram's head, accordingly in the first fiery trigon of the Zodiac, which was full of high significance as ancient astrology held, must have been already visible in the year 747-748 A.U.C. : pretty nearly at the time of Jesus' birth.† But suppose even that

* Lightf. 498 brings the Rabbi Symeon, Hillel's son, to the rescue, who must at that time have been still quite young. Venturini, 1, 165, at once thankfully accepted the hint. Still worse was it to think as several did of the Rabbi Symeon the Just (Jos. Ant. 12, 4, 1. 13, 6, 6), who was 200 or even 300 years older. Vol. I. p. 328. The Book of James declares him to have been the successor of Zacharia in the priesthood. It is an allowable question whether Luke found the destiny of the heathen in his Jewish source, or first worked it in himself as a follower of Paul. The first is, after all, not unlikely, not only because of the Jewish scheme of Mess. dogma, but also because of the clear philoëthnic traces in Luke's Jewish sources. Cf. Gosp. vii. 2 ff. Acts ii. 1 ff. viii. 26 ff. x. 1 ff. Only observe the peculiarity that the two chief personages in Cap. and Cæsarea, as well as the Æthiopian, are at all events made out to be proselytes.

† Abarbanel, Maajne Hashuah (Springs of Salvation) Amsterd. 1547. Kepler, de Jesu Christi vero anno natalitio. Frankf. 1606. Cf. Ideler, Handb. d. Chron. 2, 399 ff. Lehrbuch, p. 423 ff. Wieseler, Chronol. Synops. der 4 Ev. 1843,

the ancient Magi reckoned like Abarbanel, and shared Abarbanel's interest in Israel; yet to begin with it was a star, not a conjunction of stars that they saw, whether that of Abarbanel, or of Kepler, a star to the details of whose description as a Messianic star, even among the Jews, no extant traditional definition is known to have corresponded.* If we allow that there was a special tradition among the Magi concerning such a star of the Jews, yet the star which they saw was in any case no star such as really exists; because their star was seen to move, went before them two hours' journey to Bethlehem to show the way, and did not merely appear to move, as some tell us, and finally stood still over the house where the holy family dwelt. But let us consider the Magi, their belief in stars, their superstition, which here seems almost to receive a divine sanction, notwithstanding that according to Justin they belonged to the prey of Satan until they worshipped Jesus; let us consider too the contrast between their interest and the laggard pace of their two years' journey, in whatever light we will: still greater impossibilities are presented by Herod and Jerusalem. It is not conceivable that Herod, the shrewd king, the watchful upstart, instead of throttling the thought of a new-born and rightful claimant to the throne in the birth, may be in the blood of the adventurous travellers, should have called a solemn meeting to establish and ratify the Messianic dogma by actually paying it personal homage and recognition; that he should have nourished and intensified what, in spite of Matthew's assertion to the contrary of a mere

p. 62 ff. Art. Zeitrechnung, Herzog, Suppl. Winer, Art. Stern der Weisen. Hofmann, 129 f.

* On this account Kepler himself, and after him various moderns (Wieseler, Ebrard) have recourse to an extra star or comet (cf. already Orig. c. Cels. 1, 58), by which means the value of the discovery of the conjunction, which does not involve a fixed star or comet, even if Kepler in the year 1604 saw such along with the conjunction, is entirely demolished. Wieseler actually succeeded in calculating from *Chinese Tables* (!) for February to April, 750 A.U.C. a brilliant star. Cf. Strauss' ridicule, 372. Cf. the Comm. of Meyer, De Wette, Bleek (Synopsis).

panic at Jerusalem, were the most glowing and sanguine expectations of Israel, who certainly would have streamed in crowds to Bethlehem, and that he should have done this with the intention forsooth of afterwards making an attempt on the Messiah's life. It is contrary to all historical testimony that Herod should have exalted the position of the scribes, his deadly foes, or actually of the Synedrion, whose murderer he was, or have required from that Synedrion which according to all accounts was no longer in existence, or if in existence, at most was made up of his own creatures, an independent declaration highly dangerous to his throne, or that if he had asked for it he should have received it; and, quite as much so, that in spite of all the demonstrable diversity of Jewish opinion concerning the origin of the Messiah, indeed concerning any coming of the Messiah at all, which the Herodians, Boethosians, and Sadducees would entirely deny, yet the Synedrion should pass an unanimous vote in favour of a birth in Bethlehem.* How greatly are all these tormenting questions simplified, so soon as one can make up one's mind to the right explanation of this poetry in history's garb. Even the Old Testament was fond of making plastic representations of heathen homage to Israel's future, and to the Messiah. Kings of the East, the children of Arabia, were to come with the multitude of their camels, and lay incense and gold before him. In the midst of such pictures occurs the mention by Isaiah (lx. 1, seq.) of a Light of God, that rises upon Israel, and to which the heathen hasten from afar. Was that not, when read in the light of so many

* The Synedrion had under Herod no place at all, cf. Vol. I. p. 242, 263. To the arbitrary judicial processes which he sometimes instituted (Synedria), (against his sons, 150 persons, Ant. 16, 11, 1 ff. against the scribes, 17, 6, 3) he called ὄσους ἐδόκει (16, 11, 1) Romans and Jews of high position (τοὺς ἐν τέλει, ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων) 16, 11, 2. 17, 6, 3; and indeed just where he pleased, and with sheer violence even towards the Synedrists (16, 11, 2). Of scribes attending them there is no mention at all; he was the representative of the πάτριος νόμος, fairly to launch the irony! 16, 11, 2. As to the opinions of the Messiah's antecedents, vid. under "Birthplace" and "Public appearance of Jesus."

other passages, concerning the rising of light for the people of darkness, especially that prophecy of Balaam, ever deemed of weighty import, about the Star of Jacob, the sceptre of Israel (Num. xxiv. 17)—a star which should rise, which should lead the way, which should stand still over the house of the Messiah; which must needs bring to Jerusalem, to Bethlehem above all others the men of the Orient, the men most learned in the stars among the Arabians, laden with gold, and frankincense and myrrh?*

Whether the New Testament narrator in the symbol saw but a symbol, whose substantial truth lay not in the details of the history, but in the great history of that coming of heathendom to Jesus, which actually put Jewry and Jerusalem to shame; or whether, it is likelier he took the prophecy literally, and undoubtingly believed in the necessity of its fulfilment, and that just at the moment of the Rise of Jesus himself, although he had not seen it, at most had heard of a wonderful stellar appearance at the time of Jesus' birth—in any case he has given us ideal history: whose sensuous shape he has moulded freely, and yet as he was bound, whose substantial truth he gathered from actual intuition, even as it stands before the eyes of Christendom in every century.

The Apocrypha have added to these greetings of the newborn babe, with which on the whole they were satisfied, a few subsidiary contributions. The hour of the birth itself seemed hitherto most imperfectly described. It was a dark cavern

* See especially Isa. lx. 1 ff. ix. 2. xlii. 6 ff. xlix. 6 ff. Ps. lxxii. 10, and elsewhere. Strauss, p. 372, has appealed rather to Num. xxiv. 17 (Sept. ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ), than to Isa. lx. although here would lie the starting point. Mentions of the star of the Messiah among the Jews, Bertholdt, p. 55 ff. and Strauss, p. 373 f. Cf. especially Bar-Cochba (son of the star) under Emp. Hadrian, and Test. xii. patr. Levi 18 (the star of the Messiah rises in the heavens). Just so Matt. xxiv. 27, 30. Later in the Book of Zohar. Bertholdt, 55 ff. Pressensé, p. 281. Besides the Old Testament notion of the ἀνατολή itself co-operated. Cf. besides the above passages the notion of ἀνατολή (in the first resort = Tsemach, or Branch of David). Jer. xxiii. 5. Zach. iii. 8; vi. 12. Luke i. 78: ἀνατολή ἐξ ὕψους, where already the sense of branch passes into that of light.

which no ray of light ever visited that Mary entered, but with her entrance it was straight illumined with a heavenly light which never left it, bright as the noonday sun.* Indeed while a lustrous cloud rested before the cave, inside there gleamed a radiance, which no human eye could bear.† Besides this, above the cavern was an immense star such as had not been known throughout the length and breadth of creation shining from the East unto the West (cf. Matthew xxiv. 27), which according to the interpretation of the prophets of Jerusalem was a sign of the birth of the Messiah for Israel and the Nations.‡ During the process of the birth angels surround his approach to the world: as soon as he is born, and immediately on his birth stands on his own feet, they raise the strain of "Gloria in Excelsis" both in the cave, and, as the shepherds say, outside in their hearing also.§ Indeed outside as well the omens are numerous. When Joseph went forth to seek aid, he walked and yet he walked not, he looked into the sky, and lo! the sky shrank back in terror, he raised his eyes to the zenith, and the pole of heaven stood still, and the birds of heaven roosted: he looked upon the earth, and lo! labourers lay upon the ground, with hand in porringer, who chewing did not chew, lifting did not lift, raising to the mouth their food, yet did not raise, but every countenance gazed upwards. A shepherd was driving his sheep, and the sheep stood still, and the hand which would strike them, was raised aloft; and by the rushing river the mouths of the rams transfixed refused to drink: all was interrupted in a moment in mid course.|| Whereas Luke was silent concerning the eight days between birth and circumcision, the exact narrator found here the connecting links of a story: two days Mary remained in the cave; on the third she exchanged the cavernous dwelling

* Matt. xiii.

† Jac. xix.

‡ Matt. xiii.

§ Matt. xiii. Quem natum et super pedes suos mox stantem adoraverunt angeli.

In Jac. xix. too, there is a hint at the standing walking child: ἐφάνη τὸ βρέφος καὶ ἤλθε καὶ ἔλαβε μασθόν.

|| Jac. xviii.

for the stable vouched for by the Gospel according to Luke, in order that as Isaiah (i. 3) and Habakuk (iii. 2) foretold ox and ass might worship ceaselessly the child that lay in the manger; on the sixth day a move was made to Bethlehem; on the seventh was the sabbath, on the eighth the Circumcision.* The homage paid at Jerusalem and Bethlehem is modelled entirely on the older Gospels. We are told that Symeon was 112 years old, that he succeeded the murdered Zacharia in the High Priesthood.† The star of the Magi is described in further detail, as so large, and so bright, that all stars beside are quenched. The number of the Magi is fixed at three, the one gives gold, the other frankincense, the other myrrh, but each a piece of gold.‡ Ecclesiastical legend has since discovered their names (Melchior, Kaspar, Balthasar), their form and age, their kingdoms, the symbolic significance of their gifts with still greater certitude.§

3. The Legend of the Childhood issues further in a miraculous deliverance of the new-born. Matthew tells us of such in the connexion given above. Herod the king waits in vain for the return of the Magi from Bethlehem. He had demanded their return, in order as he said himself to worship the infant Messiah, in reality in order that he might kill him. But a vision by night has warned them. Herod is wroth and reckons. The child hidden away in Bethlehem must according to the time when the star appeared be two years old, or if this star appeared before the birth a little younger. From two years and under (whether right down to the new-born babes is however not expressly stated) he has the children of Bethlehem and the neighbourhood murdered. But even before that, immediately on the departure of the Magi, an angel has commanded Joseph in a dream to fly to Egypt. After the death of the

* Matt. xiv. xv. † Matt. xv. Jac. xxiv. ‡ Jac. xxi. Matt. xvi.

§ Cf. Hofmann, 125 ff. Beda, Op. iii. 649: Melchior senex, canus, Caspar juvenis imberbis, Balthasar integre barbatus. Melchior aurum regi, C. thus Deo, B. myrrham filio hominis morituro. The three names are well known as belonging to the Calendar (Jan. 6).

King, still in the early infancy of Jesus, the same angel summons Joseph to return, and appears anew to him, when, arrived at the frontier, he is uneasy about the new Herod Archelaos. In consequence of divine admonition Joseph removes his dwelling to Nazara in Galilee.*

The Apocrypha too have this story. The Gospel of James, it is true, makes the deliverance take place after another manner.

Mary hears of the approaching murderers, and hides her child in the manger. John the Baptist, for whom a still more determined search is made, is miraculously delivered by his mother and by God; whereas Zacharia, the father, is massacred.† On the other hand the later Matthew repeats the story of the original Matthew. Herod first seeks to waylay the Magi on all the roads; then at length he turns upon Bethlehem. But Joseph is informed one day before. Three boys accompany Joseph, a maiden goes with Mary and the child to Egypt. Oxen and asses bear the household chattels; sheep and goats walk by their side. The journey is a journey of wonders, detailed in its several stages, during which the dragons, as well as lions and panthers, in fulfilment of the Old Testament, worship Jesus and follow fawning in his train. The child of two years not only stands upright and threatens the dragons, but even says to his parents: "Fear not, and hold me not a baby; for perfect I ever was and am." It were wearisome to pursue the journey. After four days' toil the child compassionately advances the caravan thirty days' distance (almost too much) forwards to the borders of Egypt. Their stay lasted about a year: in the beginning of the child's fourth year, Jesus was back at home. The chief event in Egypt was the fall of 355 idols predicted by Isaiah (xix. 1) in the "Capitol of Egypt" the town Sotine (district of Hermopolis in the Thebaid), which took place as soon as Mary set foot in the temple with the child, and the consequent

* Matt. ii. 12-23.

† Jac. xxii.-xxiv.

conversion of the town to Christianity.* The death of Herod with all its tortures appears in the history of Joseph as the immediate penalty of the murder of the children; whereas an accusation preferred by the Jews against Jesus in the Acts of Pilate goes to show that his birth was to blame for the slaying of the children, and that even the flight to Egypt betrayed the parents' evil conscience.†

The miraculous rescue, even in its simplest form, has its insuperable difficulties; involved in its mere connexion with the legendary story of the Magi. But were we to cut out the Magi, even so it would be hard to save the narrative, if only, to mention nothing else, because Luke knows nothing whatever of any peril threatening the childhood of Jesus.

No doubt the story is not without certain historic motives. King Herod was really racked with all the torment of a tyrant's misgivings: he was really, more than ever in the last years of his life, of which we should here have to think, cruel beyond the bounds of human fancy: we have only to remember the murders in his family; the race-course of Jericho.‡ Still the cruelty of Bethlehem's slaughter would far exceed all else we know about him. We have elsewhere examples of his rage against adults who excited his suspicion. We should have supposed that this particular act of cruelty, the extirpation of the entire posterity of a town hallowed in the memory of Israel, would have been all the less easily forgotten by history, inasmuch as it has recorded the time of Herod in general with great precision. It is inconceivable that Josephus could have kept silence about the innocents of Bethlehem. For such silence as this we cannot solace ourselves with the fact that Macrobius, a late Roman satirist of the 4th century, as well as our Matthew, but without doubt on the ground of his

* Matt. xviii.-xxiv. ch. xviii. *Nolite timere nec me considerate, quia infantulus sum: ego enim perfectus fui semper et sum.* One year's stay, also Hist. Jos. viii.

† Hist. Jos. ix. Act. Pil. ii.

‡ Cf. Vol. I. p. 244. ff. Tyrannic dread, B. J. 1, 3, 2: *ἐπτόγητο τῷ φόβῳ καὶ πρὸς πάντας ὑπόνοιαν ἐξέρρηπτιζέτο.*

statement, makes mention of the murder of the children of Bethlehem, and brings it into connexion with his domestic murders, by the information that a son of Herod was murdered by mistake along with the rest.* Our gravest misgivings would be called forth by such an act with regard, we will not say, to the Divine Providence which is so very watchful on behalf of the infant Messiah, and so very much the reverse on behalf of the innocents of Bethlehem, but with regard to that prudence of Herod for which history so abundantly vouches. While he was on the look out for one, and one only, while he might easily have discovered that one, the Son of David whom he sought, by dint of searching, while he must at any price discover that one as such, if he was to be at ease, we are asked to suppose that he made wholesale and random havoc, in such a way as not only to challenge the last extreme of Israel's implacable detestation, but also his own misgivings as to the actual death of one who after all might possibly have escaped. When we take up the Gospel itself everything becomes still more inconceivable. It is not possible that the trembling and calculating king should have prefaced his plans by the utterly puerile proceeding of letting the Magi get clear away from his hands, that he should have patiently awaited their return; again, in spite of the departure of the Magi, that he should still have missed finding the infant Messiah by simply marking the house which they entered in Bethlehem; finally, that after most solemnly opening the book of Messianic dogma, he should have dealt such a blow as that of the subsequent massacre right in the very face of all that was holy in Israel, which at other times he in some degree at least was wise enough to spare. It will follow from this that the flight into Egypt, if only from its connexion with Herod and the Magi, has likewise but little to recommend it: unless one were to appeal to the then flourishing intercourse between Jerusalem and Alexandria, or even to the statements of the later Jews and

* Sat. 2. 14: Cum audisset, inter pueros, quos in Syria Herodes, rex Judæorum intra bimum jussit interfici, filium quoque ejus occisum, ait (Augustus): melius est Herodis porcum esse quam filium.

of Celsus, to the effect that Jesus had got his magical arts in Egypt.* The flight to Egypt considered by and in itself bears all the marks of a poetic picture. A no less than threefold revelation by an angel, almost too much for the thrift of heaven, is intertwined with the narrative.

The enormous toil of such a journey with a little child, who might at any rate have found a nearer refuge among the Arab tribes of the south or west, was such as only legend, aided or not by miracles, could easily get over. Finally, the return from Egypt has the appearance of a daring adventure forcibly tacked on to the prudent caution which precedes it, since in Galilee also a son of Herod was reigning, who in spite of his actual subsequent toleration of Jesus, had still the sword of a Herod ready for Messianic movements as the history of St. John the Baptist showed, and would be sure to repeat the violence of his father, as soon as the lightest breath should betray the arrival in Galilee of the fugitive from the notorious slaughter which all the country knew had taken place in Bethlehem.

An ideal notion lay at the bottom of this entire story. It can hardly be that there is nothing more in this than the idea that it belongs to godlike greatness to be persecuted by men, or simply to resemble the first of God's ambassadors Moses, so often compared to Jesus by the Gospels.† The fundamental thought was essentially the conflict of principle between the God-appointed Messiah and the false Messiah, who in the person of King Herod had ascended the throne of Israel by the human means of treachery and bloodshed.‡ Jesus being born during the time of this king the comparison with the latter was natural, more natural than that with the Emperor Augustus, and natural enough was it to draw it out in pictorial guise. The frightened, plotting, vanquished tyrant was made

* Schöttgen, p. 699. Lightf. 261. Cf. above Vol. I. p. 28.

† So Strauss, p. 376.

‡ Cf. Herod's opinion of himself, Vol. I. p. 230, 237, 239. In the New Testament elsewhere also the contrast between Χριστός and Ἀντίχριστος and the Ψευδόχριστοι.

the chief figure in the picture. The materials for further detail were furnished by the Old Testament. Once had the Pharaoh of Egypt ordered the slaying of all the male children of Israel, and according to the showing of the later tradition of Josephus, he had then in view, not only the general weakening of the people, but the crushing of a Saviour and Avenger of whom the astrologers had forewarned him.* Moses escaped miraculously the plots of Pharaoh, and once more he escaped the wrath of the Egyptians, by fleeing northwards into the wilderness towards Palestine; only to come home again obedient to the revelation of God, which was verbally repeated in the history of Jesus, with wife and children whom he conducted on the back of an ass, after the death of his enemies.† If this historical precedent at once suggested the thought of Egypt as an asylum for Jesus, just as Moses had fled *from* Egypt towards Palestine, yet this suggestion was additionally strengthened by the old national reminiscences of Egypt as the House of Sojourn for Israel; and finally, by a messianically interpreted passage in the book of the Prophet Hosea concerning the abode in Egypt, which the redactor of Matthew expressly cites: "out of Egypt have I called my Son."‡ In this way Egypt became the asylum of the Messiah. Many another single trait of the portrait is borrowed from the Old Testament. In this way the supplementer of Matthew found the murder of the Innocents in Bethlehem confirmed by the word of Jeremiah: "Rachel weepeth for her children and will not be comforted." The Prophet introduced Rachel as the maternal ancestor of Israel grieving for the carrying away of her posterity into Asiatic exile; the Evangelist found therein all the more surely a prophecy of the massacre of Bethlehemite children, because the Israelite-Christian legend placed the grave of

* Exod. i. 15 ff. ii. 1 ff. Jos. Ant. 2, 9, 2.

† Exod. iv. 19, cf. with Matt. ii. 20 f.

‡ Hosea xi. 1. Matt. ii. 15.

Rachel in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem, where it places it still.*

The settlement in Nazara he finally covers by a prophetic word which was only obscure in the Old Testament: "He shall be called the Nazarene," referring as most think, to the Nezar, or branch of David (Isa. xi. 1), though Hitzig's conjecture is more likely correct that, misunderstanding (Isa. xlix. 6) he discovered therein a Nezuri, the Nazorite, and at the same time the Ward of God, who should bring back Israel, and become the Light of the nations, the Salvation of God, even unto the ends of the earth.† Thus every where the hallowed letter of the Old Testament must be made to bring its contribution to the history of Jesus, even at the risk of being falsely expounded, now shedding light on facts, now building them up, though it did the first still more than the second so far as we incline to say with any certainty of conviction, that in spite of all additions there are still stable corner-stones in the Life of Jesus.

As reliable historical remainder of the whole legend of the infancy there is but little left, and still enough: the birth in a pious Israelitish home, the circumcision on the eighth day performed, it may be, by the father, a firstfruits of pain for this young life, by which, notwithstanding, it entered it into the divine protection and communion, into federal relations with Israel and its holy ordinances, and, in conclusion, the name of Jesus, which as Matthew hints was given him immediately after birth, or as the third Gospel tells us, may have been ultimately bestowed on him

* Jer. xxxi. 15. Gen. xxxv. 19. The grave is shown to this day, about a mile and a half from Bethlehem, no longer in its original condition: Robinson, I. 363. II. 377. Hist. Jos. vii. relates, peperit me Bethlehem in spelunca proxima sepulcro Rachel.

† Most think of Isa. xi. 1. Hitzig of Isa. xlix. 6, cf. p. 17. I have with a slight modification, made Hitzig my foundation, supposing the redactor of Matt. to have read נְצִירִי = "my ward," while Hitzig thinks of Christians as the Netsure Jahveh (New Testament σωζόμενοι). There not only does the sound of the word exactly correspond, but the end of the passage in Isaiah strikingly suits Matt. iv. 15 ff.

at his circumcision by the parents and kinsfolk, most of all by the mother.*

The name of Jesus was originally Jehoshua (transcribed in Latin Josua), which, later on, after the Exile, was by preference contracted to Jeshua. The Greek speaking Jews, unless when they adopted the stronger hellenism Jason—usually substituted Jesus, an appellation which appears in the New Testament in place of the two foregoing. The Jews of a later day too accepted this further contraction of the word sometimes even writing in Hebrew Jeshu.† The word Jehoshua, hallowed in Israel's history by Moses himself, originally signified "Jahveh," or as we pronounce it "Jehovah," "is rescue:" another substantive of like sound with the contract Jeshua, viz. Jeshuah, meant simply "Rescue," "Deliverance." Out of these significations developed the explanation of the name which is put forward already by Sirach, and afterwards in the Gospel by the Angel: "Salvation," "Saviour," "Saviour of the people from their sins."‡ This name was, especially after the Exile, much in use. In earlier times it is borne by Moses' successor Hosea, "Salvation," to whom Moses himself gave the higher religious designation Salvation of God; by a citizen of the priestly town of Beth-

* Circumcision on the eighth day: Gen. xvii. 12. Lev. xii. 3. Related by Luke ii. 21. The father (in case of need the mother) usually performed it in former times. Gen. xvii. 23. Cf. Jos. Ant. 12, 5, 4. Luke i. 59 shows rather the reverse in later times. Winer Art. Beschneidung. Entrance into Israel's ordinances, Gal. iv. 4. The name in the Old Testament given most frequently by the mother, not exactly on the day of circumcision, but immediately after birth. Gen. xxix. 32 ff. xxxv. 18. 1 Sam. i. xx. Cf. Winer, Namen. In Matthew the name appears in connexion with the birth, i. 21, 25. In Luke, along with the circumcision, i. 59. ii. 21.

† יהושע (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ), יֵשׁוּעַ, 'Ιησοῦς. Cf. on the late form Jeshu Eisenmenger, entdecktes Judenth, i. 64. Lightf. op. 1, 196. Already in Ir. 2, 24, 2. The literature on the name Jesus in Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 62. In the two rec. of the Jewish Toledoth Jesu (cf. Vol. I. p. 29), he is called now יֵשׁוּעַ, now יֵשׁוּעִי (Hannotseri). Also Jeshu, Jesus, Hase, p. 17. In the Zürich library is the 2nd. (Leyden, 1705): Sepher Toledot Jeschua Hannozcri, Hist. Jeschue Nazareni, ed. J. J. Huldricus, Tigurinus.

‡ Sir. xlv. 1: 'Ιησοῦς ὃς ἐγένετο κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μέγας ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ. Matt. i. 21: σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.

shemesh in Judah, in whose field the ark, which had been carried off by the Philistines in the time of Eli, stood still content; again, by a second son of Saul; finally, by the governor of a town in the time of King Josiah, by a patron of idolatry, it is true!

Moreover, of the four-and-twenty classes of the priesthood the ninth is called Jesus, and in the pedigree of Jesus as given by Luke appears an ancestor of like name, midway between David and Zerubabel.* At the time of the Exile, however, we find the name ennobled anew in the person of Joshua, the High Priest, the Restorer of the Holy Religion in concert with Zerubabel (520 B.C.) the servant of God, whom the prophecy of Zechariah celebrates as a forerunner of the Messiah, with many Priests and Levites from the house of Joshua at his side.† In the latest periods of Persian rule appears Jesus the son of Juda as a member of the High Priest's house.‡

Under Antiochus Epiphanes (170 B.C.) there is another High Priest of this name: who, however, with Greek affectation called himself Jason in preference; besides a Jason who was Judas the Hasmonæan's ambassador to Rome. In the same century flourish the Siracides, grandfather and grandson, both called Jesus, the authors of the well known ethical proverbs. Herod the Great is served by a High Priest Jesus the son of Phabeth, Archelaos by a Jesus Sië.§ About the time of the destruction of Jerusalem we find on the scene the High Priests Jesus the son of Damnæus, Jesus the son of Gamaliel, Jesus Gamala and Sapphia, and the priest Jesus Thebuti. At the same time in popular circles we have Jesus the son of Annas a

* Ex. xvii. 9. xxiv. 13. Numb. xiii. 17. The same is called Jeshua, Neh. viii. 17. Jesus in Sept. and Acts vii. 45. The priestly class, 1 Chron. xxiv. 11. The later Joshua, 1 Sam. vi. 14, 18. The Son of Saul, Jos. Ant. 6, 6, 6. The governor of the city, 2 Kings xxiii. 8. Jesus' ancestor, Luke iii. 29.

† Ezra ii. 2. iii. 2, 8, f. Neh. vii. 7. Zech. iii. 1 ff. Hagg. i. 1 ff. Priests and Levites, Ezra ii. 36, 40.

‡ Jos. Ant. 11, 7, 1.

§ The High Priest, Jos. Ant. 12, 5, 1. 15, 3, 1. The Ambassador, Jos. Ant. 12, 10, 6. Sirach Prologue, and l. 27.

peasant, who in the last years of Jerusalem fills and terrifies the city with his lamentations,* and in the north, in Gamala, a prominent peaceable citizen, in Sepphoris, Tiberias, Tarichææ, a leader of sedition, the robber Captain from the neighbourhood of Ptolemais, Jesus the son of Sapphia.†

The name is not wanting either in the New Testament, and by the side of Jesus Justus, afterwards a helpmate of Paul, there appears a sorcerer Bar-Jesus in Cyprus as the opponent of that Apostle : nay in enigmatic conjunction with the fate of Jesus we meet with that agitator Jesus Barabbas, whose first name, Jesus, has been erased from the great majority of N. T. MSS. since the second century (cf. but Origen) as a flagrant dishonour to the Lord, who was held sufficiently humiliated by the mere neighbourhood of the murderer. Repeatedly do we find too the Græcized name of Jason occurring in the New Testament.‡ Thus all goes to show that this appellation was something quite common in the time of Jesus throughout different provinces and classes of society, among Jews and Galilæans, priests and laity, yes if one will have it so, among good and evil alike. For the miracle-mongering discovery of Origen that in the whole length and breadth of Scripture, not a single sinner with the name of Jesus appears, while every name besides counts righteous and unrighteous alike among its bearers,—is at least not completely confirmed by the above list. Before and after Origen have the Fathers, beginning with the author of the Epistle of Barnabas, Justin, Clement, Irenæus, Tertullian, Lactantius, seen in the whole Old Testament and most of all in the solemn designa-

* Jos. Ant. 15, 9, 2. 17, 13, 1.

† Jos. Ant. 20, 9, 1, 4. B. J. 4, 3, 9. 4, 4, 3. 6, 8, 3. The Galilæan, B. J. 3, 9, 7, 8. Vita Jos. 22. Of the identity of the person in both places there can be no doubt. The peasant B. J. 6, 5, 3. Any other passages that there may be are to be found in Dindorf, Fl. Jos. opp. Par. 1865, 2, 444 f.

‡ Col. iv. 11. Barjesu, Acts xiii. 6. Jesus Barabba (Barrabba, Barrabban) Matt. xxvii. 16, 17 ; in spite of Tischendorf (even in the 8th Edit.) this rests on old authorities, beginning with Origen, and is defended by Fritzsche (1843), Rinck, Ewald, De Wette, Meyer : cf. Story of the Passion. Jason, Rom. xvi. 21. Acts xvii. 5.

tion by Moses of the successor to Joshua, divine omens of a time to come.* Thus far, however, Origen may be right, that scarcely any other name has associated with it so much of personal significance, nay of religious eminence. Hence too is explained the popularity of the name. The mere word "Help," "Heavenly Rescue," the bold and hopeful watchword of the Maccabæans in sultry battle against Syrian odds, gave just expression to the most burning desire of these later times of need, and in the heroic forms of the conqueror of Canaan and the restorer of the Temple and Altar, the wistful sigh embodied itself in solid and substantial vision, in the triumph of a glad reality.†

What occasioned the giving of this name to Jesus, whether regard to ancestors or relatives, of which the genealogy of Luke contains some, though quite faint, indications, or the general religious tone of the parents, who will pretend to decide? At most one may say, the religious and historical significance of the name was certainly not left out of sight by a pious Israelitish house, even though there was no approach to the bold presumption that the new-born babe was literally to be the Salvation of the world.

That men were seeking, waiting, longing for salvation, that alone was expressed by this name in like manner as by that of John, that salvation actually came with this name, and that at the same time and sooner too, both when, and even before, Jerusalem in her fall was encompassed by countless helpless names of Jesus, calling to God,—this was that very dispensa-

* Orig. in Matt. d. l. Rue 918, in tanta multitudine scripturarum neminem scimus Jesum peccatorem, sicut in aliis nominibus invenimus justorum ut ejusdem nominis inveniantur etiam iniqui. This with immediate critical reference to Jesus Barabbas, whom Origen would make out to be an importation of the heretics. Cf. Tischend. 8. critic. Ed. The Fathers Barn. 12, Just. Tryph. 75, and elsewhere. Clem. Pæd. 1, 7, 60. Ir. 2, 24, 2. Fragm. 19, 20 (in the first place יֵשׁוּ = dominus cœli et terræ cf. Gen. i. 1). Tert. Mare. 3, 16. Eus. 1, 3. Lact. Inst. 4, 17. Cf. Otto's Note on Just. Tryph. 75.

† The Maccabæans' watchword, Vol. I. p. 311, note †.

tion of providence transcending human expectation, on which the picture-loving legend built up the destiny of the child along with his name. That an angel brought the name is unlikely, if for no other reason, because it was so common among the people, and yet so little provided for in the Old Testament. The same grounds compel the acknowledgment, which even otherwise we could hardly withhold, that the name of Jesus neither rests upon a later self-designation of Jesus, nor finally on a later invention of the Apostles or Christians: full of meaning as the name was, yet invention would far sooner have spoken, in accordance with the Messianic passage in Isaiah cited by Matthew, of an Immanuel.*

THIRD SECTION.—PLACE AND TIME OF BIRTH.

Concerning the time and place of the Birth, the Legend of the Infancy has itself some detailed information to give. Still it appears in order to consider these questions separately, partly because the legend of the Infancy is of wide enough extent as it is, and partly because within the limits we have now assigned a more definite result may be at once desired and expected.

The birth-place of Jesus has been fixed by the sources which speak of the subject, namely, the two Gospels and the Apocrypha, yes, even the *Toledoth*—at Bethlehem. Justin Martyr, indeed, had the assurance in the face of the Roman Emperors to appeal on behalf of the Birth in Bethlehem to the census of Quirinius, whom however he erroneously calls the first Imperial Procurator.† Bethlehem, found also, in Josephus under the contract form *Bethlem*, called *Beitlahm* by the Arabs

* Matt. i. 23.

† Tol. Ed. Huldr. p. 5. This recension (cf. p. 77) makes Mary with her seducer, Joseph Pandira of Nazara, fly before the face of her husband Papus from Jerusalem to Bethlehem and in consequence of Herod's interference fly to Egypt, thence, driven by famine, come to Nazara with altered name. Just. Ap. 1, 34.

to this day, the native town of David and his nephews, the three hero-sons of Zeruah, Joab, Abishai, Asahel, and, as such, ennobled, though, called, as it often was, only a village, it could scarcely find a place in a list of Judah's towns, lay six Roman miles, about two hours' journey, south of Jerusalem.* The aspect of the little town of to-day, situated in terrace fashion on a height formed by a flat saddle uniting two hills on the east and west, with about 200 massive limestone-built houses, encircled by fig- and olive-trees, vines and corn-fields, which mark off the "House of Bread" from the encroachment of the desert,—is described as charming. The 3000 inhabitants are entirely Christians, of ancient western blood, at once brave and polished men, and excellent carvers in wood. They still show the cave where Jesus was born, within whose narrow, low and faintly lighted confines, thousands have counted themselves blessed but to stand: the valley too, where the angels approached the shepherds; and their witness has the support of 1600 years, for as early as the third century, in the time of Origen, both Christians and heathens were shown the cave and the manger in Bethlehem, and in the fourth century Helena, the pious mother of Constantine, aided by the Emperor himself, built on the eastern hill above the cave the splendid marble-cased basilica, admired to this day by pilgrims from the west as already in the year 333.†

* Called a town, Judges xvii. 7 f. Luke ii. 4. Jos. Ant. 5, 7, 13. 6, 8, 1. 8, 10, 1. indeed under Rehoboam πόλις ὄχυρά καὶ μεγάλη. On the other hand, 5, 2, 8 : χωρίον. Κώμη, John vii. 42. Just. Ap. 1, 34. Tryph. 78. New Testament, Βηθλέμ, Jos. once Ant. 8, 10, 1; Ant. 5, 2, 8, Βήθλεμα, ἀπὸ Βηθλέμων. Twice Βηθλέμα, plur. 5, 7, 13. 5, 9, 2. Twice Βηθλέμη, 6, 8, 1. 7, 1, 3. Its insignificance, see Mic. v. 1, and the lists of the towns of Juda (cf. Josh. xv. 60. Neh. xi. 25 ff.) in which Bethlehem is wanting. Κώμη τις Just. Ap. 1. 34. He counts thirty-five stades from Jerusalem = 1½ league. Eus. Jer. 6 miles. Cf. Winer, Arnold in Herzog, Art. Bethlehem.

† Cf. Robinson, II. 377 ff. Sepp. I. 436 ff. He gives a more detailed account of the Christian monuments, and declares with others decidedly for the Constantinian primitiveness of the Church. Furrer, p. 167 ff. Collection of earliest accounts of the cave (Just. Tryph. 78. Orig. c. Cels. 1, 51. Eus. Dem. Ev. 7, 2 : Vit. Const. 3, 41-43. Jer. Mare, 18. Epiph. Hær. 20) in Winer, Arnold, Bethlehem, Rob. 285. Sepp. 441.

It may appear rash in the face of so many venerable and even monumental testimonies, to regard the Birth at Bethlehem with doubt. But to begin with, we know that the third and fourth centuries, which were the first to lay their finger upon these sacred spots, are a late witness, and one that is little at a loss in the finding up of relics. And if we simply abide by the basis of those late discoveries, by the oldest testimony we have, viz. that of the Gospels, the legend of the Infancy which narrates among other things this birth in Bethlehem, lacks confirmation to start with in various points. But just in this single point there are grave difficulties. To begin, Matthew and Luke diverge widely from each other, inasmuch as the former, simply following out his assumption of a regular permanent residence of the Holy Family in Bethlehem, knows only of a birth of Jesus in the ordinary parental home in Bethlehem; the latter, presupposing the parents' domicile to have been in Galilee, only of a birth in Bethlehem on the journey, in a strange house, in fact an inn. A similar discrepancy runs through the Apocrypha; most follow Luke, only with this peculiarity, that in place of the stall in the inn, in conformity with the old tradition represented by Justin Martyr, who appeals to Isaiah xxxiii. 16, and saturating the legends of the Church, they put a cave in which the pair had to shift as best they might in or near Bethlehem, or, as the later harmonizing "Matthew" has it, the double expedient of cave and stall in one. On the other hand again, the Gospel of the birth of Mary rather repeats the original Matthew, and yet attempts to square him even with Luke, inasmuch as in that account Jesus is born in Joseph's newly furnished house in Bethlehem, and that immediately after the removal from Nazara.*

* Just. Tryph. 78: ἐν σπηλαίῳ τινὶ σύνεγγυς τῆς κώμης κατέλυσε. Had the cave been first spoken of in the fourth century, in which the belief in the 25th of December in connexion with the worship of Mithras arose, one might explain the cave from the cultus of Mithras, the unwelcome parallel of which however Justin already notices. Pseudo-Matt. xiii. xiv. : spelunca, — stabulum, Ev. Nat. Mar. x. cf. viii.

If now in choosing from among these accounts we are compelled in any case to waive that of the first Gospel, since as has been shown above, Bethlehem cannot possibly have been the constant abode of the parents of Jesus; yet just as little likelihood is left for the view of Luke, that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, on the road so to speak. Without doubt many great names have come into the world under circumstances no less precarious; the only question is whether such stressful stages are historically demonstrable or probable. And here the most serious point is the entire untenability of the motive assigned by Luke for the journey from Nazara to Bethlehem. It was, we are told, on account of the taxing proclaimed by the Emperor Augustus that Joseph travelled to Bethlehem with Mary. Chronological investigation will hereafter have to show that such a taxing at the time given by Luke (and by Matthew as well) for the birth of Jesus, never took place at all. But assuming meanwhile its occurrence, yet the journey of Joseph to Bethlehem is beset with inconceivabilities, which can only be explained as the result of a huge confusion on the writer's part of the Roman census with the Jewish registration of tribes and families. While it might be in some sort of agreement with Jewish customs, to make a list of the descendants of a house after the lapse even of a thousand years at the seat of their ancestral home, yet this manner of cataloguing the population, conceived on so large a scale as that of the whole country, by this time, *i.e.* after the lapse of a thousand years, and after the Babylonian exile, was even among Jews a matter of impossibility, involving as it would, on account of the vast changes of residence among the scions of the respective houses, nothing less than a migration of peoples.* The Romans,

* The great counting of David, early as it was, is so described, 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 ff. as that only those who take the numbers go round from tribe to tribe (*βάδιζε, εἰλεθε, περιώδενσαν*) and that *ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ, εἰς πάσας τὰς πόλεις*, not as a migration of the people, although such a migration of peoples would have been then a smaller matter. Without doubt, simply those who dwelt with a tribe would be reckoned as belonging to it.

however, to crown all, took as the foundation of their census, demonstrably not the ancestral home, but the dwelling-place and civil abode.* From this rule it was impossible they should depart in the case of Judæa, all the more so, as the contrary system would have involved the hugest vexation, disturbance and confusion in a country full of ferment as it was, while at the same time it would have fundamentally frustrated the entire object of the census.† The rating of an inhabitant of Galilee in Judæa and in Bethlehem might have had perhaps some semblance of sense, if the person in question had been born in Bethlehem, and held the right of citizenship as an heirloom from his father, together with all that appertained thereto, with house and possessions, even though resident abroad; but of all this there is not a word in Joseph's case, since his whole connexion with Bethlehem is made to depend on his remote relationship to David. But if his person, his family, his fortune, were rated as belonging to Judæa, while all the while the whole belonged to Galilee, the census of Judæa would be as incorrect as could possibly be made, doubly incorrect, yes counterfeit, and at the same time a menace of usurpation levelled at the ruler of Galilee, for not Galilee but only Judæa had actually fallen into Roman hands.

Worse still does the case stand with regard to Mary's journey to Jerusalem. The need for the wife's accompanying her husband on such a journey, although deemed plausible without more ado by the Gospel of James, cannot be shown either from Jewish or Roman Law; unless appeal be made to the procedure (branded expressly as an act of tyranny by his contemporaries) of the Emperor Galerius, who, in the fourth century after Christ, forced not the men only, but their wives,

* Cf. Huschke, über den zur Zeit d. Geb. Christi gehalt. Census, 1840, p. 166 ff. Paulus, Exeg. Handb. on Luke ii. 1 ff. Strauss, 339.

† According to Neander (L. J. quoted by Bleek Synops. 74) this method of census was rather the most lenient!

their children and their slaves, to present themselves at the Census.*

The most reasonable remark, still possible, on the subject would be that of the later "Matthew," that Mary herself, as equally a scion of the house of David, perhaps heiress, went with her husband, if only the Davidic descent of Mary, together with the whole story, were invested with the slightest trace of probability.†

If then Mary did go, she can only have shared the journey of her own free will. In answer, however, to the opinion that situated as she was, she would have felt herself especially in need of the personal protection of Joseph, lies the somewhat more cogent retort, that a woman on the point of giving birth to a child, would scarcely have exposed herself to the hardships of a three days' journey, the turmoil of the crowd, and that publicity which, even in ordinary times, was so scrupulously shunned, and that Joseph too would not have sought to attract the attention of all Israel to the peculiar plight in which he found himself, and which is graphically depicted in the Gospel of James.‡

Here, then, matters stand simply as follows:—The birth of Jesus in Bethlehem is devoid of all adequate historical evidence. The two witnesses who mention it (for their evidence stands alone) are involved in the most serious mutual contradiction, and if we decide to believe Luke rather than Matthew, yet he has brought a birth to pass in Bethlehem instead of in the home at Nazara, by the most forced expedients. Indeed both writers at bottom have nothing but a forced history to show;

* In the Old Testament it is always the men that are counted, cf. Winer, *Zählen*: among the Romans statement was also made in the census of wives and children, Dion. Hal. 4, 15. Cf. Pauly, *Encycl. Census* II., 249. The cruelty in the East in the fourth century, Lact. *Mort. Pers.* 23. The passage, Jac. xvii. is interesting by the way on account of the doubt of Joseph, whether he shall register Mary as a wife or daughter.

† Matt. xiii. (Bethlehem), quia inde erat Joseph et Maria de tribu Judæ et de domo et familia David.

‡ Cf. the women shut up from publicity (*καράκλειστα*) in Philo, and in 2 Macc. p. 33. The literal rigour is shown by the Rabbis and Toledoth, p. 4.

only each in his own way. According to the first, Bethlehem is the abode of Jesus' parents, but by dint of circumstances which we cannot recognize as historical, by means of Herod and Archelaos, the foes of the Messiah, Nazara is soon afterwards their new abode. According to the other, in conformity with a correct historical reminiscence, Nazara is the original and permanent abode, but through accidental circumstances, again dubious in themselves, Bethlehem becomes the birth-place. Moreover, in the real history of Jesus, which follows the introductory story, they exhibit at every turn the most credible notices of Jesus as of Nazara, and of Nazara as the native town of Jesus. Mark, too, and the Acts of the Apostles, and the Gospel of John, know nothing different; nay, the latter (shall we say of mere irony?) represents the people as missing in Jesus the Messianic note of Bethlehemite birth. Paul again is not in a position to complete his description of the antecedents of Jesus as Davidically derived, by the mention of a birth in the town of David, a consideration to which he could hardly be indifferent.* And to abide simply by the main point; a name of such significance in the world's history, "Jesus the Nazarene," would not only have been an entire misnomer, if he were indeed only a settler in Nazara, as even the comparison of the name of one of the twelve, Judas living in Galilee, but named from his home in Juda the "Man of Cariot"—might show; but it would be besides the most inconceivable of wonders; for the popular tide of favour on which Jesus once was borne, could never have forgotten the more commendatory Jewish, not to say Bethlehemite, origin, in order to substitute the obscure, despised and Galilæan one, —and even the fierce hatred of his foes could never have reversed, not to say distorted to his disadvantage the original fact, which must have so deeply imprinted itself on the memory of this people, so versed in pedigrees, so eager for the Messiah. What does it signify in the face of all these facts, if Ewald is of the opinion, that the reminiscence of the parents of Jesus

* Cf. above p. 17. 22. John vii. 42. Gal. iv. 4.

having been on their wanderings at the time of his birth, could not have been quite groundless. When every single statement is called in question, when the ideal ground of such wandering is palpable to the grasp, it is but lost labour to split that wandering up into an ideal and an actual one.*

The belief in a birth in Bethlehem, however, arose very simply, and the demonstration of how it arose completes our right to assume the birth at Nazareth. The belief arose from dogmatic reflexion. Not so much that it suited the ideal view of Jesus better to have him born in Judæa than in Galilee, striking as is the parallel that the fourth Gospel is fond of representing Jesus as the Jewish rather than the Galilæan prophet. Inasmuch as the two Gospels lay no stress upon Judæa, as such, but only on Bethlehem in Judæa, inasmuch as the first Gospel expressly cites the passage in the Prophet Micah, which calls the coming ruler of Israel out of Bethlehem, it is clear that they looked for the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem as an indispensable Messianic sign.† Though Micah himself may have understood the coming forth of the ruler from Bethlehem by no means in so rigorously literal a sense, but merely as a coming forth from the house of David; though among the later Jews the belief in the Bethlehemitic origin of the Messiah may but very partially have prevailed; so long as this belief had a footing in certain strata of the populace; a belief which is first witnessed to already in Christian times, first in the Targum of Jonathan (on Micah v. 1), and afterwards by the Talmud, so long as in a few circles (as the fourth Gospel recounts) this special legitimation of Jesus was desiderated; granted, finally, that the passage in Micah might arouse reflexion among those circles so busy in their search for Scripture proofs with ransacking the pages of the Old Testament, that was quite sufficient to bring into being not only tales about the birth in

* *Geschichte Christus*, 1st Ed. p. 149.

† Matt. ii. 5-6. From Micah v. 1. See on this passage, Hitzig, *Kleine Propheten*, 3rd Ed. 1863, p. 205.

Bethlehem, but likewise, in spite of all obstacles, a belief in the same.* How much besides, from the virgin birth down to the duplicate of beasts at the entry into Jerusalem, the pieces of silver, and the field of blood, was really brought into being by this spirit of Old Testament research.† To the difficulties with which Bethlehem is beset no man of sense, just for the sake of slaying a captious criticism with its own weapons, would oppose the like as attaching to Nazara. Are we to say that Nazara is fiction too, because it was once for all agreed that the Galilæan Messiah, Ben-Joseph, was to be born in some town in that land, and so forsooth in Nazara? Of course the history of Jesus has nothing to do with the later fancy portraiture of the Galilæan Ben-Joseph; while for putting Ben-Joseph in Nazara there is not the shadow of a pretext in any rational interpretation.

Side by side with the question of the place, stands that of the time of Jesus' birth. The reigning Christian computation of time, that sovereign authority in accordance with which we reckon our life, and which is surely above the assault of any critical doubts, goes, be it remembered, but a very little way towards the settlement of this question, in as much as its inventor, a Scythian by birth, Dionysius the Less, Abbot of a Roman monastery (died 556 A.D.), in his thoroughly meritorious undertaking, the really Christian work, soon acknowledged in England and France, of counting the days of the world from the birth, or rather Annunciation and Conception of Jesus, instead of, as hitherto, from the Roman Emperors and Consuls, were however at that time already on the wane, or actually from the first

* Cf. the Rabbinical passage on Bethlehem in Hier. Berach. f. 5, cited by Lightf. 257: undenam ille (rex Messias)? Respondit alter: e palatio regis Bethlehem Judæ, &c. At the time of the destruction of the Temple he was said to be born in Bethlehem, Menahem was his name, he was reft from his mother by storms: his after residence was in Rome. Prevalence attaches to the view of his unknown antecedents (πov) Tryph. 8. Cf. Ochler, Messias p. 438. On Jonathan p. 433. John vii. 42.

year (284) of the reign of Diocletian the persecutor of the Christians,—had certainly no entire immunity from human frailty. It is not our intention by means of hazardous and, at any rate at this point of our inquiry, indemonstrable assumptions as to the time of the historical public appearance and death of Jesus and his age at that time, to reckon back to the year of his birth: it must here suffice either to reach our goal, or not to reach it, with the aid of the definite statements of our earliest sources with regard to the year of birth.* The comparatively best assured and best supported account places the birth of Jesus in the reign of King Herod the Great. Matthew knows no other chronology: Luke gives the same, along with another, or, if we will, along with two others.† Matthew more particularly, in his own account, puts the birth in the last years of that king. Jesus is a little child at the time of the coming of the Magi, and he is still a child at the return of Joseph from the flight into Egypt, after the death of Herod has taken place. We shall hit the sense of the writer most exactly if we assume that Jesus, at the time of the coming of the Magi, who gave King Herod ground for conjecturing a Messiah of about the age of two, —was about two years old; at the time of Herod's death, about four. For on the one hand, Jesus here appears to be still a child, while on the other, the stay in Egypt seems not to have been after all so very short, and the death of Herod is not represented precisely as a sudden visitation. The Apocrypha have reckoned pretty nearly in the same way, only they were free to shorten the stay in Egypt, because it pleased them in

* Cf. Ideler, *Handb. der Chronol.* 1825 f. *Lehrb.* 1831. Wieseler, *Chronol. Synops.* 1843. Anger, *De Temporum in Aet. Ap. ratione*, 1833. The star of the Wise Men, and the year of Christ's birth, *Zeitschr. f. histor. Theol.* 1847. On the Chron. of the Ministry of Christ, 1848. A. Schweizer, *das Verhältniss der ev. Vorgesch. zur Bestimmung des Jahres der Geb. Chr. Theol. Jahrb.* 1847. Literature of the subject in Winer, *Herzog (Aera, Zeitrechnung)* and Hase § 26.

† Matt. ii. 1 ff. 19 ff. Luke i. 5, 24 ff. On the course of Abia (Luke i. 5) spite of all attempts (down to Wieseler, Lichtenstein) no computation can be founded. Cf. Hase p. 64.

Herod's death to read the wrath of God. Hence the History of Joseph has fixed just a year for the stay in Egypt.

Pseudo-Matthæus however made the exact reckoning : coming of the Magi, end of the second year of Jesus' life ; stay in Egypt, one year ; settlement in Nazara, beginning of the fourth year.*

Now since Herod died, as we saw, shortly before Easter of the year 750 A.U.C., *i.e.* 4 years before the Christian era, Jesus must have been born four years before, 746 A.U.C., or 8 years before the reputed Christian era, a view which is expressly espoused in the fifth Christian century ; according to the Apocrypha, 3 years before Herod's death, 747 A.U.C., 7 years B.C. If we are able in addition to build upon Kepler's Conjunction of Planets, which Bishop Münter, in his book, "The Star of the Wise Men," 1827, called to remembrance, we get with complete certainty 747 or 748, the latter, that is, if we attach any value to the fact that in that year Mars was added to Jupiter and Saturn.†

Desirable however as such certainty might be, it is nevertheless hard to abandon oneself to it with enthusiastic joy. To begin with, our confidence is not greatly won for this conjunction, on which the Gospel is silent ; remarkable as even we find this coincidence ; yes, willingly as we concede with Neander the remote possibility of a faded historical tradition of the more or less exact coincidence of a notable celestial phenomenon with the commencement of Jesus' life. But supposing we leave that on one side, and content ourselves

* Hist. Jos. viii. Permansit (in Ægypto) spatium unius integri anni, donec transiit invidia Herodis. ix. : obiit pessimo mortis genere penam luens effusi puerorum sanguinis. Matt. xvi. : transacto secundo anno venerunt magi. xxvi. : post regressionem Jesu de Ægypto, cum esset in Galilæa, jam inchoante quarto ætatis anno.

† Cf. Vol. I. p. 248. The eclipse of the moon, Ant. 17, 6, 4 : 12-13th March. Ideler, Lehrs. 423. Sanclemente, Ideler, Huschke 747, Kepler 748. Wieseler arbitrarily makes two stellar appearances, the conjunction, and two years later the Chinese (750). Lichtenstein (749). Wurm 751. Ewald, Gesch. Christus, p. 119: Jesus was supposed to be *at least* about two years old before Herod's death.

with building on the intimate connexion of the birth of Jesus with the last years of the king, yet we cannot overlook the dubious character of a relation which seems to stand or fall with the legend of the Magi. So indeed Hase himself declares: he who doubts the historical substance of the first chapters of Matthew has no right to think about Herod, since popular legend has brought together people far more widely removed from each other than here may be the two great kings of Israel. We may add that we have found a fundamental conception of the Magian legend to consist in an ideal comparison of the Messiah with the Pseudo-messiah of Israel.* Still the question may arise, whether the legend may not here as elsewhere have worked up real historical facts, whether it may not, somehow or other, have spun its web on to the correct tradition of an actual birth of Jesus under King Herod. On behalf of this consideration the assertion will not hold, that if Jesus were not actually born under Herod the King, but only under his sons Archelaos and Antipas (the sole alternative open to us) about 750-760 A.U.C., between 4 B.C. and 7 A.D., the sons, especially the one also named in Matthew, viz. Archelaos, would at any rate have done the legend the same service.† This was so far not the case, as the sons lacked, not indeed the nature of Herod, but still, in the midst of their mutilated and falling empire, that nimbus of glory which attached to the father's reign, and which presented a counterpart to the Messiah, at least strong enough to be striking. Yet indispensable as was the figure of Herod to the idea of this legend, it had already so far an historical background, as it remained clearly conscious of historical sequences, in so far as accordingly it withstood the temptation, of picturing the death of

* L. J. 5th Ed. p. 64. Cf. above p. 94.

† Below the year 750-760 A.U.C. we cannot descend for the Birth of Jesus, for as much as Jesus would else have scarcely reached the age of 30 altogether, against which many reasons protest. In passing I would observe that the Toledoth place the whole life of Jesus under Herod the Great.

the king as a judicial visitation, in so far finally as it could only have made use of the figure of Herod, if he really lived somewhere near to the time when Jesus began his life. Besides this, an actual reminiscence on the part of the Christian community of the approximate point of time at which the Lord was born, would be hard to call in question, even though it might have overlooked or forgotten every detail of the youth of Jesus besides. Finally, there is after all a trace of such reminiscence independent of all legendary formation. The introductory history of Luke without any appreciable historical connexion, rather in conflict with the world of legend represented in his Gospel, places the birth of John the Baptist and of Jesus in Herod's time.* At the same time there is here just as little, or even less, sign than elsewhere in Luke's preliminary story, of any dependence on the account in Matthew, or any world of legend like his. We should thus still be inclined to infer that Jesus, according to ancient Christian tradition, was born under King Herod, and more particularly, according to the legend of Matthew, which after all is the better guaranteed of the two, towards the close of his reign. It will have to be shown later on, that even the end of the history of Jesus puts no veto on this assumption.

While thus by the aid of the statement common to the two Gospels, we are brought at all events to a tolerably certain result, yet Luke by his more precise computations of the birth, upon which he himself lays far greater stress than upon the former datum, threatens rather to land the whole question in confusion. At most his calculations are helpful to the problem

* Unless one were to assume that in Luke's sources the expression, i. 52. was an allusion to a speedy fall of the Pseudo-messias which may have been presupposed and described in these sources. But this would be but an empty hypothesis, since Luke appears to have made an exhaustive use of his sources, and since moreover the passage in question quite simply connects itself with the general Messianic expectation. And were it ever directed at all to the house of Herod, yet according to the context (cf. ii. 1) we should have to think not so much of the death of Herod, as of the deposition of Archelaos, about 10 years later, which brought the census in its train.

only quite indirectly inasmuch as in the first place by their self contradictions they serve to raise the value of the former assertion common to both Gospels, and secondly, inasmuch as they fix the years 750-760 as at any rate the extreme limit of the birth of Jesus.

For Luke appears, as we said, so far to give the most precise boundary line to the birth of Jesus, inasmuch as he brings it into immediate connexion with the first taxing of Judæa by the Romans, which admits of exact historical computation. The Roman taxing was indeed the occasion of Joseph and Mary's journey to Bethlehem, and of the birth of Jesus in the inn there. This taxing took place, as Luke quite rightly observes, for the first time in Judæa, under the Emperor Augustus, and, more precisely, under Quirinius' Governorship of Syria, and moreover, as we saw in our survey of the political condition of the country, not only after the death of Herod, but also after his son Archelaos had been reigning about ten years, in consequence of the dethronement of Archelaos and the annexation of Judæa and Samaria by the Romans in the year 760 A.U.C. 7 A.D.* But here too at once begins the difficulty. According to this statement Jesus would have been born from ten to fourteen years later than the Gospels otherwise assert, Luke himself included. This late birth would not only clash with the first statement of the Gospels themselves, but equally with all probability, inasmuch as Jesus would then not have been as much as thirty years old at his death, which in any case took place before the recall of the Procurator Pilate (781 A.U.C. 35 A.D.). We are here therefore compelled to acknowledge a simple error of the writer, which one may pardon him if one has regard to the absence of his data for chronological calculation on the one hand, and, on the other, to the ideal beauty and truth of the thought, that Jesus was born at the time of the complete enslavement of his people, which, however, was also at the same time their enrolment into the empire of the world.†

* Cf. above Vol. I. p. 255 f.

† Cf. above p. 80 f.

The error itself, however, we may all the more readily concede, in that a series of demonstrable historical errors have befallen him, and that in connexion with the very same historical problem.*

The hundredfold well-meant attempts to set the erroneous chronology of Luke to rights, or even to prove it right after all, are matter henceforth, as heretofore, rather for the exegesis of the Gospels than for historical research. It was moreover less history than dogmatic concern partly for the infallibility of the sacred writers in general, partly for the literal earnest of the story of the childhood, which called into being these attempts at explanation, tortuous as they often were, and abortive as they must prove consistently with the laws of language, as of logic.†

* Thus he designates (Luke ii. 1) this taxing of Augustus as a taxing of the whole Roman world, whereas it was confined to Syria, nay, whereas Augustus held indeed repeatedly—thrice (726, 746, 767) a census populi, *i.e.* of the Roman citizens (726, about 4,000,000; 767, about 5,000,000) but by no means such a general census covering all provinces. *Res Gestæ d. Aug.* Ed. Mommsen 2, 2 ff. Cf. p. 15, 21 f. 70. *Snet. Octav.* 27. *Dio C.* 52, 42. 53, 1. 54, 35. 55, 13. Wieseler, *Chronol. Synops.* p. 84 ff. Bleek *Synops.* 1, 68 ff. (against Husehke). Moreover, Luke, Acts v. 37, has spoken of the taxing in such a manner as (1) to place the taxing after the rise of Theudas, which however took place many years later under the Emperor Claudius (not before 44 A.D., unless, as notably Wieseler so late as 1867, we were to make a new Theudas); (2) so as to make the orator Gamaliel at the time of the Emperor Tiberius speak of the rise of Theudas, which was long (7—10 years) after that time, as something that belonged to his past experience. Finally, the historical data, Luke iii. 1, are very doubtful (cf. our History of the public appearance of Jesus).

† The text has been corrected! the name of Quirinius first of all erased: instead *Κυρίναιου, Κρονίου, Σατουρνίνου* has been substituted (Sent. Huet., Heum., Capell., Vales., even Tert. c. Marc 4, 19: S. Saturninus), or a *πρὸ τῆς* was inserted after *ἐγένετο* (Mich.) or *αὐτῇ* changed (*hæc* It. Vulg.) into *αὐτῇ* (Paul.) or *αὐτῇ ἡ* (Vat. Sin.) into *αὐτῇ=talis* (Wieseler). Or a thorough transformation was made of ver. 2: *αὐτῇ ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη Σατουρνίνου, δευτέρα δὲ ἐγένετο ἡ γ. τ. Συρ. Κυρ.* (Whiston), similarly Venema: *ἀ. ἡ. ἀ. π. ἡ β' ἐγέν.*, of which it was only the obverse side to eject the verse altogether (Beza, Kuinöl, Olshaus.). If the text was left alone the language at least suffered ill-treatment. Here *ἡγεμ. Συρίας* meant *subsequently* Governor of Syria (Lardner, Münter), or at any rate *not* Governor, but Commissioner Extraordinary (Casaub., Grot., Münt., Ideler, Hug, Neand., Ew.), or what was philologically far away the most splendid feat, *πρώτη ἡ γ.* meant the first in comparison with the later ones of Quir. (Herwart, Cler., Petav., Heum., Storr, Süssk., even Thol., Wies., Husehke, Ew., Pressensé), or

When men had gradually made up their minds so far at all events to a surrender, as that they acknowledged more or less considerable errors in Luke, and were fain to hold fast, if they might, but a bare historical basis, even though it might furnish no chronological gain, either by supposing instead of a Roman census, a purely Judaic revision of the pedigrees on the part of the priests, or by turning the Governor Quirinius of Syria into an imperial commissary, who had before been busy in those parts, yet lately the discovery or refurbishing of an inscription concerning Quirinius by antiquarian research, together with the demonstration in good earnest of the actual fact of Quirinius' former presence in Syria, which indeed Usher had already brought to light from Tacitus, brought with it the complete solution in Luke's favour, and therefore the most joyful satisfaction to those who had beheld that writer sacrificed to criticism with the extremest reluctance.* This inscription was discovered as early as the year 1764, between the Villa Hadriani and the Via Tiburtina, in the neighbourhood of Rome, and since 1765 repeatedly made known by the press, finally with the aid of a fresh copy made by Th. Mommsen in the Vatican Museum, by Bergmann in 1851; by Mommsen in 1865.† Already

finally the *context* was ill treated, by distinguishing ver. 2 as something in a manner later than ver. 1, whereas the tenor of the words in relation to ver. 1, and the continuity carried on in ver. 3 plainly posited identity and simultaneity; whether one chose to read with Panl. *αὐτῇ* (Gersd., Ebr., Hofm.) or leave *αὐτῇ* as it stood (Glöckl., Thol.) and lay stress on *ἐγένετο* as expressing the actual accomplishment (v. Gumpach), or, more generally to distinguish *ἀπογραφῇ* ver. 1 as a mere registration or inventory from *ἀπογραφῇ* in ver. 2 as census, as introduction of the impost (Kün., Olsh., Ebr., Wies., Ew.). See the Comm. of Meyer, De Wette, Bleek: Synopse, Winer, Art. Quirinius and Schatzung.

* A Jewish register of families was supposed by Schleierm., Luke, p. 35 f. Bleek, Syn. 1, 74. Hofm. (L. J. nach Apocr. p. 100), pointed out that Jac. Ev. xvii. favoured such an assumption, although closer inspection shows that is neither the case here, nor Matt. xiii. Hist. Jos. vii. Meyer, on the other hand, thought of something like a census under Quir. as former Commissioner; on Luke, ch. ii. Already Usher Ann. II. 530: proconsul Ciliciæ and at the same time censor Judææ.

† Sanclementis de vulg. æræ emendat. 1793, 418. Rich. Bergmann d. inscriptione lat. ad P. Sulpicium Quirinium, ut videtur, referenda. Berl. 1851 (with

Sanclemente (1793), more lately Bergmann, Mommsen, Nipperdey referred it to Quirinius, and found therein an intimation of a double Governorship of Quirinius in Syria, or at all events in the East.* Free from doubt the matter certainly is not; Quirinius is not named, the list of the deeds of the person celebrated sounds somewhat different to that in which Tacitus sums up those of Quirinius, especially remarkable would be the total oversight of the highest position attained by Quirinius, that of Adlatus to the young C. Cæsar in the East, about 753 A.U.C.† Hence A. W. Zumpt conjectured in preference the Syrian Governor, Sentius Saturninus, to which view Bergmann also was at first inclined, while Huschke guessed Agrippa. But if we grant that the inscription in any case, as Zumpt himself says, suits Quirinius or Saturninus best of all the Augustan dignitaries in Syria, further, that as Th. Mommsen as well as Gerlach proves, it is less appropriate to Saturninus than to Quirinius, especially as in the case of the latter and not of the former a second residence in Syria admits of some probability, and if we add, moreover, that the subjugation of the mountain tribe of Homona (the Homonades) in the Taurus, on the borders of Lyconia, Pamphylia and Cilicia, which is recorded by Tacitus too as occurring soon after the consulate of Quirinius, (742 A.U.C. or

Mommsen's copy). Cf. Nipperdey on Tac. Ann. 3, 48. Zumpt Commentat. epigraph. Vol. 2, de Syria Romanorum provincia (1854). Id. in Hengstenberg's K. Z. 1865, No. 82. Gerlach against Renan, 1864. The Roman Governors, 1865, p. 24, ff. Strauss, die Halben und die Gauzen, 1865, p. 70 ff. Hilgenfeld, Quirinius als Statthalter in Syrien, in his Zeitschr. 1865, 408 ff. See also Gesch. Chr. p. 225. Mommsen de P. Sulp. Quir. tit. Tib. in R. G. d. Aug. 1865, 111 ff.

* The Inscription (printed in larger type) as restored by Mommsen—*vicit Homonadensium gentem et regem: qua redacta in potestatem divi Augusti Populique Romani Senatus decrevit sup plicationes binas ob. res prospere gestas: ipsi ornamenta triumphalia. Proconsul Asiam provinciam obtinuit. leg. Divi Augusti iterum Syriam et Phœnicen administravit. In his Res gestæ div. Aug. Mommsen restores somewhat differently: quæ (gens H.) interfecerat Amyntam regem (Galatiæ cf. Strab. 12, 6, 5): qua redacta, &c.*

† Tac. Ann. 3, 48: Quirinius—consulatum sub divo Augusto, mox expugnatis per Ciliciam Homonadensium castellis insignia triumphi adeptus datusque rector C. Cæsari Armeniam obtinenti Tiberium quoque Rhodi agentem coluerat.

12 B.C.) may best be connected with a governorship in Syria; on which account too we could only build with Zumpt on Tacitus: we have in that case indeed a twofold period during which Quirinius was engaged in Syria, the first, according to Tacitus, (as well as according to the inscription restored by Mommsen) after the year 742 (12 B.C.); the second, according to Josephus and the inscription in the year 760 (7 A.D.), after the dethronement of Archelaos, and at the time of the first census in Judæa.* And, it is true, the first Governorship would, more exactly, have to be fixed with Mommsen and Zumpt within the only interval open to us, 750-752 A.U.C., 4-2 B.C. *i.e.* after the conjectural departure of Varus from Syria (748-750), and before Quirinius' entrance on the office of Adlatus in attendance on C. Cæsar (753 A.U.C.); for the opinion of Gerlach that Quirinius was entrusted with the province of Syria at the same time as Varus, is quite untenable, and only invented out of consideration for Luke.†

All this conceded—a former presence of Quirinius in Syria and Palestine before the census of the year 7 A.D., the vague

* Of a cogent proof there is then no question. The inscription itself is not quite certain, and is restored (not it is true as regards the main point) somewhat otherwise by Mommsen himself now than formerly. Tacitus diverges. The names and successions of the Governors of Syria are not quite certain. That the Governor of Syria was intimately concerned in a conflict with the mountaineers is not beyond all doubt (Bergmann thought of the *Proprætor* of Galatia). But highly probable is the complication of the Syrian Governor with the *Homonades* (cf. Strabo 14, 5, 6. Tac. Ann. 6, 41. 12, 55), in this case, however, even according to Tacitus the double governorship of Quirinius in Syria is assumed, then, again, finally the *iterum Syria* of the inscription may be referred with the greatest confidence to Quirinius. Hence Mommsen also lately says: *attributio Sanctæmementiana non solum probabilis habenda, sed plane probata res est* (Res Gest. 117). The chief objection of Strauss. *iterum* refers only to *legatus* not to *Syria*, is *sophistical*.

† Gerlach, Röm. Statthalter, p. 32. Mommsen (Res Gestæ d. Aug. 115-124) places the appointment of Quirinius to Caius Cæsar, only, it is true, after the death of Lollius (755) as the first of Cæsar's *Rectors*, *i.e.* 756, so that the Syrian Government of Quirinius might fall 750-755. Yet he even assumes 751-752, and the former assumption itself is in collision with Tac. Ann. 3, 48. Suet. Tib. 12 f., and Mommsen is obliged to help himself by a forced explanation of Tac. The passages show that Quirinius in his position with C. Cæsar visited Tiberius in Rhodes, and paid him homage there (that is 53-55) which as Lollius' successor he could no longer have done. But Lollius must, according to these passages, have been with Cæsar 754-755, and intrigued against Tib. in Rhodes.

possibility of a census before *the* census, during the first residence, 4-2 B.C., even the remote possibility of a Roman census under the national ruler Archelaos, whom Augustus had only appointed on condition of good behaviour, and therefore might make sensible of his subjection, rather than the father, his old ally, Herod: yet for the matter in question, and the narrative of Luke, not a jot is won. Of a census of Judæa during Quirinius' first Governorship there is after all no mention anywhere. Josephus and all Jewry and even Luke himself in the Acts know only of a taxing at the time of the second Governorship ten years afterwards, with which the revolt of Judas Galilæus coincided. If Luke in the Gospel speaks of a "first" taxing, he simply understands thereby, as does Josephus, that which took place at the time of Judas Galilæus in contradistinction from any later ones subsequent to the year 7.*

And after all it is easy to show that a census before *this* census, could not possibly have happened. Even under the reign of Archelaos it could as little occur, as under that of King Herod. True, it is still maintained that even under Herod a Roman census was possible. Appeal is made to the dependence of the vassal-prince, to the accurate lists made by Augustus of the subject kingdoms, and allied provinces, their capacity in troops and money, to the alleged Roman census in allied provinces, or finally to the temporary disfavour shown by Augustus even to Herod.† But Augustus might have learnt

* Luke ii. 1 ff. Acts v. 37: Ἰούδας ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογραφῆς. Cf. above Vol. I. p. 255.

† The dependence of the vassal-prince can be proved by the necessity there was for Herod to obtain for his action against his sons, even for the place of trial, the approval of Augustus, Ant. 16, 4, 1. 11, 1, by the oath of fealty taken by the nation to Emperor as well as King, 17, 2, 4. Cf. Mommsen R. G. d. A. 69. Then Augustus' fits of displeasure, 16, 9, 3-4. 10, 8-9. 11, 1. The sovereignty of Augustus: rationarium (breviarium totius imperii); Suet. Octav. 27. 28. 101. Tac. Ann. 1, 11: quantum civium sociorumque in armis, quot classes, regna, provinciæ, tributæ aut vectigalia. Di. C. 53, 30. Mommsen Res G. d. Aug. p. 3. Taxings within Roman territory; Suet. Octav. 27. Cf. p. 115 Note. In the Province of Gaul, Tac.

Judæa's capacity in round numbers, without so hard an interference with regal rights, which he otherwise sedulously respected. His disfavour was very transient. To end all, the so-called Roman census in other allied provinces, would by itself prove nothing in Herod's case, and when looked closely into, is nothing but an imitation, on the part of a Prince of Asia Minor, independently undertaken, of Roman taxation. Archelaos succeeded to the same sovereignty; and although before his accession the imperial treasurer Sabinus may have concerned himself with the castles and the coffers of Herod, yet to begin with this was something wholly different from a census of the people, and in the next place, there is not a trace of Augustus having curtailed the princely independence of Archelaos, which was to develop into a kingly one, in a single point, during the ten years of his reign. Thus Th. Mommsen himself, in spite of the inscription and in spite of the double Governorship, has loudly, repeatedly, and with legitimate scorn of a theology, which is so little a match for his weapons, declared the utter impossibility of a census before the dethronement of Archelaos,* *i.e.* before the *one* census, 759-760. Consider moreover the impression which the census would make among the people. We should think the Romans would scarcely have undertaken the toilsome and invidious task of a census anywhere twice within the space of ten years to speak of nothing else; but especially among fresh subjects, and for what purpose? † In the case of this people whom they knew,

Ann. 1, 31. Supposed Roman census in country of allies (Cappadocia) Tac. Ann. 6, 41: Clitarum natio, Cappadoci Archelao subjecta, quia nostrum in modum deferre census, pati tributa adigebatur, in juga Tauri Montis abcessit. That the Romans then came to the help of their ally is no proof that *they* took the census.

* Mommsen cited by Bergmann p. vi. f. quum per Judæam, antequam in provinciæ formam redacta esset (759), census ex imperatoris Romani auctoritate habitus esse nequeat. Res. G. d. Aug. 125: at inde minime sequitur, bis censam esse Judæam a Q. et primum quidem eo tempore quo a Romanis nullo modo censi potuit quæque ejus generis alia homines theologi vel non theologi sed ad instar theologorum ex vinculis sermocinantes inde effici posse sibi primum, mox aliis persuaserunt.

† Cf. p. 115 Note.

they would have still less inducement. In fact, one can see clearly, that if they here made one census, they did not so soon do it again. And this one census lay in the heart of the year 760, not 750, 7 A.D. not 4 B.C. The word census, as a *new word* kindled the revolution of Judas of Galilee, in the year 760.* Suppose in the teeth of all possibility, that already in 750 the hated word and hated deed had swept throughout the land, then in truth the wrath of Israel, then in truth the Galilæan would have been roused to revolt in the year 750, then history would not have been silent on the point, then indeed in 760 Rome would not have repeated, nay would not have begun, the census, nor Judæa the revolt. Repose amid these difficulties is sought in the expedient of assuming that the first census was arrested on some unknown grounds; Gerlach is actually acquainted with the details; that those serviceable assistants in time of need the Homonades had called away Quirinius to Cilicia, where, however, he only forgets that according to his own opinion Varus was still upon the spot for the purposes of the census.† Besides, Luke surely would show that the "first" census continued to take its course, and was taking place in good earnest in Judæa, until the journey from Nazara to Bethlehem. Moreover, Luke could by no means have agreed to the year 4 B.C., as Gerlach himself perceives in opposition to Zumpt, inasmuch as he would place the "first" census earlier, namely, as is manifest, in the lifetime of Herod the Great.‡

It is to be deplored that even the younger Zumpt, called up afresh by Hengstenberg, should have allowed himself to be entangled in such impossibilities.

* Cf. Vol. I. page 255 ff. Jos. Ant. 18, 1, 1: τὸ κατ' ἀρχὰς ἐν δεινῷ φέροντες τὴν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀπογραφαῖς ἀκρόασιν.

† Gerlach p. 32—35. To this and the like (probably too Wieseler's rescue of Luke from the "clumsy stroke") refers the sharp word of Mommsen R. G. d. Aug. 126; sane indignum facinus, ne in hac quidem luce literarum larvas illas tenebricosas conquiescere posse, &c.

‡ Luke is in fact feeling at once after 740-750 (i. 5) and after 760 (ii. 2).

A real worth after all could be won for the narrative of Luke, inscription, Tacitus and all, only if we could place the birth of Jesus in accordance with the writer's meaning, fairly and simply in this so happily vindicated first period of Quirinius' office, without any thought of the secondary consideration of a census, which had got in by a misconception. Thus we should have to look for the year of Jesus' birth, between the years 751-752, or 3-2 B.C., and in this way too should bring the three divergent calculations of Luke into tolerable accord. But of course Luke does not mean this newly discovered Quirinius at all, but the old one of the year of census 760; and even were it otherwise, the calculations would still be to some extent at fault, for the first account of Luke places the birth of Jesus in the reign of King Herod, whereas Quirinius did not enter on his Syrian post until some time after Herod's death, hardly before the spring of 751.*

By Luke's notice of the census as the time of Jesus' birth we have then gained nothing. But let us allow him by another course to correct the here notorious blunder. Once more then does Luke incidentally compute the time of the birth of Jesus. By describing the time of John the Baptist's appearance and speaking of Jesus at that period as about thirty years old, he favours the assumption, that Jesus was born about thirty years before the fifteenth year of the reign of the Emperor Tiberius.† An accurate calculation is no doubt here out of the question, inasmuch as to begin with it is not precisely the thirtieth year of Jesus which is assumed for that point of time, and because moreover it is doubtful if Luke intended to lay any stress upon the number, and not rather, by means of the round number, upon the fact of the manly maturity of Jesus. Besides it is not quite certain, whether Jesus appears at his baptism on the entrance of the Baptist on his ministry, or some time later. Finally, we shall hereafter see grounds for considering the

* Cf. Vol. I. p. 251 ff. The earliest would be autumn 750.

† Luke iii. 1 ff.

commencement of the Baptist's ministry, as fixed far too early anywhere near the date 28 A.D. But if after all we assume the figure, as it stands, the fifteenth year of Tiberius, reckoning his reign from the 19th of August, 767, or 14 A.D., was the year 781-782, or 28-29 A.D.* In that case Jesus must have been born, reckoning about 30 years backwards, towards the year 751-752, *i.e.* 2-3 years before our reputed era. This mode of reckoning has at least the merit of only differing from his first computation by a smaller number of years, and, with the proviso that Luke thought of the birth of Jesus as taking place in the last year of King Herod, by only from one to two years. It would also suit the Quirinius of the year 751, only not him of the Census, 760.

Of the later attempts to restore the year of Jesus' birth, those of antiquity and of modern times claim our attention in different ways. In the former case one would like to discover a possible remnant of more exact reminiscences, in the latter accurate calculation based on the old materials. But our disappointment is greater than ever. For antiquity, as may be well supposed, knew no more about the birth of Jesus than the Gospels did, and, as may again be well supposed, it took for its basis the latest and seemingly most precise statement of Luke, which tries at the same time to mediate between the first and the second calculation (751-752 A.U.C. 3-2 B.C.) with all kinds of variety of form.

Thus Irenæus, followed by Tertullian, Hippolytus, Jerome, gives the forty-first year of the Emperor Augustus, Clement of Alexandria the twenty-eighth year of the same, as the year of birth: much the same in both cases, *viz.* (751-752) inasmuch as the former reckons from the first consulate of Augustus after the death of Cæsar (731 A.U.C.), Clement from his conquest of Egypt (724).† Later authorities since Euse-

* On Wieseler's and others' reckoning from the year 765, see under Public Appearance of Jesus.

† Ir. 3, 21, 3: *natus circa primum et quadrages. annum Augusti imperii.* Tert. adv. Jud. 8; *quadr. et primo anno imperii Augusti, quo post mortem Cleopatæ*

bis, the first Church historian, marked the forty-second year of Augustus, following a notice of their predecessors, that is 752-753, which date however Eusebius would make out to agree with the year of Clement, with the twenty-eighth year from the occupation of Egypt.*

But how many other years besides were possible! Here Sulpicius Severus (400 A.D.) pushed back beyond the limit set by Irenæus, naming at one time 746-747 as the time of Jesus' birth, at another the consuls of 750, and the latter date has also been found up by the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy.† Here again the date was shifted lower down than the figure of Eusebius to the forty-third year of Augustus, *i.e.* 753-754. This date is found already in Tertullian in one reading, though in conflict with the year 41; the Chronograph of the year 354 puts it down with the express mention of the Consuls Cæsar and Paulus at 754 A.U.C., the Egyptian monk Panodorus

imperavit, nascitur Christus. Et supervixit idem Augustus, ex quo nascitur Christus, annis XV., et erant reliqua tempora annorum in diem nativitatis Christi anni XLI. Before: nam omnes anni imp. Aug. fuerant anni LVI. Clem. Al. Strom. 1, 21, 145: ἐγεννήθη δὲ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν τῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ εἰκοστῷ ἔτει—ἐπὶ Αὐγούστου. Then as Tert.: 15 years under Aug., 15 under Tib.=30 years. The 41st year from 711=751-752 or 3-2 B.C. The 28th from conq. of Egypt (724) in Clement=751-752: again the 15th before the death of Aug. 767 as in Tert. August 752-753. The variation in both is between 751-753. Cf. besides the already mentioned chronol. handbooks of Ideler, Wieseler, Anger: Seyffarth, Chron. Sacra, 1846. G. Röscher, Zum Geburtsjahr Jesu, Jahrb. deutsch. Theol. 1866, 1, 3 ff. Gieseler K. G. 1, 1, 69. Hase L. J. p. 66. Winer Art. Jesus: also Herzog, Art. Aera, Jesus.

* Eus. H. E. 1, 5. ἦν δὲ οὖν τοῦτο δεύτερον καὶ τεσσαρακοστὸν ἔτος τῆς Αὐγούστου βασιλείας, Αἰγύπτου δὲ ὑποταγῆς καὶ τῆς τελευτῆς Ἀντωνίου καὶ Κλεοπάτρας ὀγδοὺν ἔτος καὶ εἰκοστὸν. The notice of Clem. and Tert. 15 years before death of Aug. (752-753) gave the number. Just so Chron. Epiph. August. Oros.—Jerome on Is. ii.: quadrag. primo anno. Inst so Cassiod. The latter has besides Lentulo et Messala coss.=751. Hippolyt. in Röscher. p. 18 ff.

† Sulp. Sev. Chron. (ed. Halm 1866) II., 27 gives side by side the 33rd year of King Herod and the Consuls Sabinus and Rufinus (750). Anno imperii ejus (Herodis) tertio et XXX. Christus natus est Sabino et Rufino coss. VIII. Cal. Jan.—Her. post nativit. domini regnavit annos IV. The consuls lead us to 750, the 33rd year of Herod (plainly from 714, not first from 717, when he conquered Jerus. Cf. p. f), to 746-747. The Gosp. of the Infancy ch. ii. 309th year aer. Alex., cf. Hofmann, p. 100.

(400 A.D.) has so reckoned it; and the founder of the Christian reckoning, the Abbot Dionysius (Easter Table 525 A.D.) introduced it for all time.* It would go hard to prove whether this assumption is owing rather to incorrect computation of the years of imperial reigns, or to astronomical considerations, or finally to a greater supposed precision in weighing and counting the statements of Luke, by making some extra allowance for the age of Jesus as "about" thirty years, or his coming to the baptism of John, which had at least then commenced, the beginning of which, according to Luke, must have fallen in the year 782 A.U.C.† But what is certain is that this year 754 A.U.C. 1 A.D., this official Christian calendar, does not hit the tradition of the Gospels.‡ In modern times, thanks to the efforts of great astronomers and chronologists, Kepler, Ideler, and Münter, the year 747 or 748 has found the greatest favour as the year of the Wise Men's star. But since people have come back from their enthusiasm for the discovery of this conjunction to a more faithful regard for the Gospels, it has always commended itself afresh, to place the birth of Jesus at latest in the first beginning of the year 750 (4 B.C.) *i.e.* before the death of King Herod, but if possible from two to four years earlier still 746-748, or 8-6 B.C. Thus Ewald inclines half to the year 748, and half to 749: Petavius, Usher, Lichtenstein to 749, Bengel, Anger, Winer, Wieseler to 750, Wurm indeed following Scaliger to 751, finally in latest times Rösch, attaching great weight to the statements of the Fathers, as well as to the Chinese star, actually gets by a multifariously laborious method, at 751-752, in which year, as he decides, even Herod must have been alive in spite of Josephus, and on the strength

* Tert. adv. Jud. Ch. 8. The year 43 is expressly given by Abulfarag. Hist. Dyn. ed. Pocock, p. 109 (Hofmann 100). The Chronograph in Mommsen in the transactions of the K. Sächs. Gesellesch. der. Wiss. 1850, 547 ff. Panodorus in Gieseler, 1, 1, 69.

† Cf. Just. Tryph. 88: *τριάκοντα ἔτη ἢ πλείονα ἢ καὶ ἐλάσσονα μείνας*, Cf. Luke iii. 23.

‡ The year is reckoned from 1 Jan. to 31 Dec. The exact starting point 25 March (Conception.)

of an innocuous observation by a Jewish Rabbi.* If it was hard enough to arrive at any certainty, or, at all events, probability with respect to the year of Jesus' birth, we must entirely waive all pretensions to tell the month or the day, however justifiable may be our curiosity on this head. Our traditional observance of the Day of Jesus on the 25th of December is not prescribed in any ancient calendar; indeed while the birth-days of the Emperors and Kings of that period do not lack reliable attestation, here reigns a silence which no search can ever more break through. By means of the Gospels some have thought themselves at least obliged to remove the birth from the inclement months of winter, and in so far by criticism to scatter the belief in a birth-day in December. It was proved, namely, that in the Holy Land from November to February no shepherds and no sheep dwell in the open air: only overlooking the fact, that the charming tale of the shepherds in Luke can as little abide so rigorously historical a handling, as that of the census, which is equally at variance with a winter date.† In Palestine's neighbouring land of Egypt several precise reckoners of the second century placed the birth-day of Jesus at the point of the year's transition from drought to fertility,‡

* Cf. Wieseler Art. Zeitrechnung. Ewald, p. 119. Wurm in Bengel's Archiv. 2., 2, 311 ff. Rösch, loc. cit. p. 46 ff. Scaliger too is said to have hit this year. Rösch, p. 7, takes notice too of my calculation of the year of Jesus' death in the Gesch. Christus; but the equitable observation on p. 9 he might have spared himself.

† So, following many others, Winer too in his Jesus. Of course Lichtenstein, Wieseler, A. Zeitrechnung follow suit, with much solemn talk; Wieseler, however, consoles himself with an especially mild winter, particularly in December or February. Winer chooses March. Cf. Shabb. fol. 45. 2 in Lightf. 496. hæc sunt pecora eremi, ea enim quæ prodeunt pastum circa tempus paschatis et pascuntur in campis et domum redeunt ad pluviam primam (incipit tertio mensis Marheshvan, media est septimo, nltima decimo septimo. Nedarim fol. 63. 1). The month M. is between October and November.

‡ Clem. Strom. 1, 21, 145: 25th Pachon = 20th May, on the verge between the fruitful and the wet third of the year before the summer solstice. Another date shows the 19th of November (25th Athyr), the beginning of the sowing season. Cf. Lepsius, Aegypten, Herzog. I., 140. Rösch, p. 16 ff. The Conception in March acc. to Hippolyt. (Paschal Canon of year 222: 25 March. Cf. Eus. 6, 22) Annianus, Panodorus in Rösch, p. 20 ff. 34 ff.

in the month of May: less, probably, out of regard to the sheep, than with an eye to the symbolical character of this season; as similarly in the Church the dating of the Conception from March, the time of the vernal equinox, appears early enough in the third century. Yet already were the foundations laid in the above named land for a celebration in mid-winter. The Gnostic sect of the Basilidians held the 15th, and a part of them the 11th of Tybi, *i.e.* the 10th or 6th of January as the festival of Jesus' baptism, at which the Holy Ghost, the divine intelligence, according to the Jewish-Christian view, was united to the man Jesus. This party thus laid the ground for the oldest Christian festival, the festival of the Manifestation, or Epiphany. This feast found favour also with the orthodox Church of Egypt; but in opposition to Heresy its votaries proceeded to celebrate upon this day the original and fundamental wedlock of the godhead and manhood in the birth of the Incarnate.* This usage may reach back to the second or third century after Christ: the Western John Cassian found it in his journey to Egypt in the year 390 to be an old tradition of the land, to celebrate the day of Epiphany at one time rather as the baptismal at another rather as the natal festival of Jesus.†

From this absorption into the Feast of Baptism the Birth-day of Jesus was delivered by the West. At all events since the middle of the fourth century under Pope Liberius (352-366), probably, according to old accounts, as early as from the time of Pope Julius I., whose entrance upon office came into close

* Clem. Strom. 1, 21, 146. Cass. Collat. patr. 10, 2: intra Ægypti regionem mos iste antiqua traditione servatur, ut peracto Epiphaniorum die, quem provincie illius sacerdotes vel dominici baptismi vel secundum carnem nativitatis esse definiunt, etc. Cf. Gieseler, K. G. 1, 1, 186. 1, 2, 287 f. The meaning of 6 January is not quite certain. Time of growth (cf. Joh. iii. 30) midway between October and March? or second divine day of creation, sixth day of the Roman commencement of the year? The passage in Clem. rather shows that from the 14th year of Tiberius the 15th month was got at. The assumption of the 11th day, however, might be a reference to Tiberius' entrance on his co-regency (beginning of January, 765).

† Epiph. ed. Dind. 2, 482.

contact with the death of the Emperor Constantine (337-352); in this part of the world, and more particularly in Rome and Italy, the 25th of December was celebrated, a date which moreover stood nearest to an earlier calculation of the time of Clement of Alexandria, viz. November the 19th. This point of time had many recommendations, not the least of which was furnished by respect for Roman heathendom. In itself and for its own sake the day had to fall in accordance with the Calendar somewhere before the Feast of Baptism, which just at that time was coming into observance in the West from the East, and furthermore three-fourths of a year after the Conception (25th March). Then again according to the improved Calendar of Cæsar the 25th of December was the day of the winter solstice (Bruma), a day which in later imperial times under oriental influences was celebrated as the birth-day of the sun (*natalis Solis invicti*), as Mithra's day, and was in turn itself ushered in by a series of festal days, the older festal cycle of the winter solstice. In the neighbourhood of this day lay the great public gala-days of the Saturnalia and Sigillaria (17-22 December); then too the festival of the New Year (Strenæ), with its mutual love-tokens in the shape of banquets and presents, particularly to children and slaves, and this origin of the festival remained long enough in remembrance, not without many a pagan reminiscence, nor yet without many an outcry against its pagan parentage.*

* Cf. Gieseler, 1, 2, 288. Kurz, K. G. 1, 2, 256. Near the same day were the Saturnalia, extending from the 19th, then 17th of December, over 3-5 days (17-21), concluding with the Sigillaria (21-22), when the children had presents made them of little figures (*sigilla*), as grown persons had of all kinds of gifts at the New Year (Strenæ, Suet. Tib. 34.) A part of these heathen usages was with evident economy transferred in Christian Rome to the time about Lent and Easter (Carnival). The 25th December (VIII. Cal. Jan.) *natalis solis invicti*; hence the inscriptions: *Soli invicto comiti, socio Mithrae*. Cf. details in Pauly, Real-Enc. Art. Sat. Sig. Sol, Mithras. Cf. my Uebertritt Constantins, 1862, p. 39 ff. 92 ff. The reminiscence of the heathen origin Leo M. Serm. 21, 6: *Sunt, quibus hæc dies solemnitatis nostræ non tam de nativitate Christi, quam de novi, ut dicunt, solis ortu honorabilis videatur*. On the other side, the Manichæan Faustus reproached the Church for celebrating *Calendæ* and *Solstitia* with the heathen. Aug. c. Faust. 20, 4.

Hence Piper too has lately attempted to connect the 25th of December rather with the 25th of March than with the heathen festivals, and to crown all P. Cassel, who expresses his astonishment that it has escaped every one else, explained the 25th of December rather from a prophecy of Haggai's concerning the New Temple, "on the eve of the 24th of the 9th month," far as he is from being able to prove this calculation.* In ancient blame and modern scandal alike it has been overlooked, that the extrusion of the heathen feasts by the high festival of Christendom was not only good policy, but that there lay therein a beautiful and deep idea, soon consciously recognized as such, that, namely, of elevating the beginning of the year's solar strength, and Nature's growth into the symbol of the enlightening, warming, and life-giving power of the Gospel, and the highest unfolding of brotherly good will in the pre-Christian world, into a prophecy of the accomplished dignity, freedom and equality of mankind in Christ. Hence also the Roman festival, recommended by its meaning so pregnant with significance to the nations, and supported by popular custom, which outlasts and renews the youth even of religions; and doubtless also by imperial majesty, by Constantine and his sons, in whose system of equalizing Paganism and Christianity, worship of Spirit and of Sun, it took its place as a most indubitable daughter,—found entrance and acceptance with unheard-of speed.† The Chronograph of the year 354, Jerome, Augustin, Sulpicius Severus, Paul Orosius, (who however goes as far wrong as the 26th of

* Haggai ii. 18. Cf. thereon Hitzig. 1 Macc. iv. 52. Cassel, Art. Weihnachten, Herzog, 17, 591 f. For the 25th of March however the day suits on the whole, but not precisely: besides the 25th of March made its way to acceptance much more slowly. Cf. Steitz, Herzog, 9, 91.

† On the Emp. Constantine, his worship of the Sun, his attempts at fusion and his observance of the Sunday, cf. my Constantine, 1862, ff. 92-96. The like among his successors, cf. the coins, also the instances of P. Cassel, Art. Weihnachten in Herzog, 17, 592. His explanation, like that of Piper, does not explain (leaving all else out of sight) the speedy and truly enthusiastic acceptance of the new festival, and even the Fathers of the Church are not silent on its fundamental meaning.

December), finally Dionysius the Less, espoused the 25th December as the Day of Birth.* The East too, receptive to start with of solar festivals, was not behind-hand. Chrysostom in a Christmas sermon, celebrates the Festival, in Antioch, 386, as one long observed in the West from Cadiz unto Thrace, though scarcely ten years known to the East, but now already naturalized, a festival which he called the Leader, and Metropolis of all festivals, and of whose historical foundation he was so sure, that he appealed, as Justin before him, to the extant acts of the Taxing of Quirinius. Gregory of Nyssa praised it as the day of the Victory of Light over Darkness. Even Egypt could not escape the spell in spite of her traditions: while Cassian even in the year 400 still witnessed to the observance of the 6th of January half as birth day, and half as baptismal day in Egypt, the 25th of December was 30 years later, at the time of the Council of Ephesus (431), possibly in virtue of Cyril the Patriarch's alliance with Rome, introduced in Alexandria as well as in the dependent diocese of Jerusalem.†

Lost labour as it now would be to make war with critical weapons on the day so long hallowed by the Church, still more fruitless were the scrupulosity, which should attempt to collect, to estimate, not to say to attach any credit to the divergent individual views of later times. Why there is not a segment of the year, but has been before now in one way or another named and honoured as the month of Jesus' birth: by antiquity as early as the second century the 19th or 20th of April, the 20th of May, or even the 19th of June, the 19th of November; by those who espoused the cause of the Wise Men's star one of the three days of concurrence of the planets of the year 747 (in May, October, and December), where the calculation which

* VIII. Cal. Januar. Sulp. Sev. p. 124 note: cf. Röscher, p. 33 ff.

† Cf. Gieseler, Kurz, loc. cit. Cass. coll. p. 10, 2: *intra Ægypti regionem—utriusque sacramenti (Birth and Baptism) solemnitatem non bisarie ut in occiduīs provinciis, sed sub una diei hujus (epiph.) festivitate concelebrant.* Also p. 127 Note. At the time of Clement it is obvious (Strom. 1, 21, 145 f.) that both days were kept still clear apart.

required May or December curiously coincides with older theories; by Wurm January to March, by Wieseler February, by Winer March, by Lichtenstein June or July, by Lightfoot the autumn, the time of the Feast of Tabernacles. If we add Rome's December, the Egyptians' November and January, the whole year has been covered and enriched with the birth of Jesus.* Since the ancient sources say nothing on the subject, we have simply before us, as old Clement saw long ago, speculations as trifling as they are troublesome, and in part doubtless luxuriant fancies too.† Real history waives all attempts to know the Day of the Lord, and while it confesses its ignorance it can only invite men to celebrate it with the Church in the customary single month, or on every day on which the light of Christianity has rested.

SECOND DIVISION.—THE YEARS OF PUPILAGE.

FIRST SECTION.—THE SCHOOL.

However foreign to us the curiosity which seeks in the youth of Jesus all sorts of striking and palpable prodigies, yet there is a curiosity not only allowable but incumbent on us, which makes us regret that with regard to the youthful development of the Prince and Leader of mankind even the most modest measure of clear reliable knowledge is withheld from

* 19th or 29th April (24th or 25th Pharmuthi) Clem. Strom. 1, 21, 146 (some). 20th May (25th Pachon) Ib. § 145 (several). 19th June as well as 20th May, Epiph. Hær. 51 in Rösch, p. 11; 19th Nov. (23rd Athyr) acc. to Clement, ib. 17. The conjunctions of the planets Winer fixes (Art. Stern der Weisen) acc. to Ideler's Handb. 2, 339 ff. 20th May, 27th October, 12th November. Ideler, in his Lehrb. (1831) 429: 29th May, 30th September, 5th December. Wieseler (Art. Zeitrechnung, Herzog Supplem.) 29th May, 1st October, 5th December. Besides cf. Gieseler, K. G. 1, 1, 70. Bleek, Synops. 1, 78. Lichtenstein, in the Lebensgesch. des Herrn J. C. in chronol. Uebersicht, 1856, cf. Art. Jesus in Herzog's R. E. Light. Hor. Hebr. 257.

† Clem. Strom. 1, 21, 145: εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ περιεργότερον τῇ γενέσει τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν οὐ μόνον τὸ ἔτος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν προστιθέυτες.

us. In place of the lad and the stripling, it is only the well nigh finished man who in the days of John the Baptist presents himself to view, so that there is little left us but to ask in amazement, How came he to be what he is? except a certain diffident and limited attempt to conjecture some traces of the process from the actual result.

If with a faithful husbanding of our resources we take in hand the scant reminiscences from this period which the Gospels have preserved, we find it is only the third Gospel, which here as elsewhere seeks to describe the customary stages in the life of a Jewish child, that gives us first the general statement of the growth and waxing strong of the favoured child of God, and then a single instance of wisdom early won, and divine countenance enjoyed in the story of the boy's pilgrimage when twelve years old to the feast at Jerusalem.* Yearly, as Luke tells us, the father, faithful to the law (Exod. xxiii. 14 ff.), and with him the mother, though not legally bound, went up to the paschal feast, whose pre-eminent splendours may be set forth more in detail in the account of the final entry of Jesus into Jerusalem. This time Jesus was allowed for the first time to accompany them, as he was approaching his year of legal maturity (the thirteenth), and on the point of becoming "a Son of the Law," Ben Hattorah, Ben Hammitsva.† For a week, as long as the feast lasted, they remained at Jerusalem. On the way back the parents missed the son, but they continued their journey until the evening, because they supposed him to be with some acquaintances in the long Galilæan caravan. According to the apocryphal Thomas, Jesus showed how the divine impulse within him burst all barriers of restraint, by turning back *from the journey* to Jerusalem. However, even in the first night station, at Sichem, or it may be in the neighbourhood of the Jewish Shiloh, they found him not, and

* Luke ii. 40-52.

† Cf. as to the 13th year p. 135 the passage on the ages from Pirk. Ab. 5, 21. Besides, Lensden, p. 87. Jost too correctly asserts the 13th year against Ewald (1857, I. 398). Cf. Wetstein on the passage and Bleek, Synopsis, I, 91.

now returned with anxious heart to Jerusalem.* On the second evening they arrived, and on the third day at length they found him in the Temple, yet not as might have been thought, at the sacrifices, but in one of the halls, probably in the Synagogue of the Temple, which served the purposes of the Sanhedrim as well as of the scribes, in the hall of the "Hewn Stones," (Lishchath Haggasit) to the south-east of the inner forecourt, in the midst of the teachers of the Law, expounders of the supreme will of the Most High, and sitting in the threefold ring of their scholars (as was the custom) on the ground, hearing them, asking and answering; gazed at, on account of his intelligence, with astonishment by all.† Mary the mother addressed him. She reproached him, but in a gentle tone, betraying her recognition of the early maturity of her son. "Child, why hast thou dealt thus with us? See, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing?" A pregnant saying, the gleaming dawn of a clearer knowledge, the bud of a rich future fruit, was the answer, "How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's possessions?"‡ In this deep meaning word lay the inkling of an infinite claim on the near regard of the heavenly Father, of a divine Sonship outbidding far the earthly in enjoyment, in right, in duty; and yet at the same time a self-deception of the most childlike sort, a childlike limitation, in that the upward yearning would confine itself to the walls of the Temple, the place of God's abode, in forgetful-

* Sichem, first station, cf. Lightf. on Luke, p. 500. Distance a long day's journey, cf. Jos. Ant. 15, 8, 5. Shiloh, still Jewish, about four leagues more to the south (Judges xxi. 19). Cf. however, Leyrer, Strassen in Palästina, Herzog, 15, 164.

† The places of the scribes in the forecourts and halls, in the synagogue by the Temple, Lightf. p. 500, Herzfeld, 2, 391 ff. 3, 131. The floor was of fine stones. The threefold ring at least in the case of the Synedria. The Jewish tradition that the hearers did not sit down till since the days of Gamaliel the Ancient, but formerly stood (Ib. cf. Mt. v. 1, xiii. 2), is modified by Acts xxii., 3 Macc. 3, 32. Strauss n. L. J. p. 389, makes out without reason that Jesus was not seated at the feet of the Doctors, but sitting as *par inter pares*.

‡ This explanation (in domo patris, Ev. Arab. 53) is recommended by the context as against the other possible one: be about my Father's business.

ness meanwhile of the laws of earthly life.* The parents, that is Mary, understood not the word, but she kept it in her heart. Returning home, they continued the work of their son's discipline; and while he increased in age, in wisdom, and in favour with God and man, he was subject at the same time to his parents.

The Evangelic story appears in a still better light, when compared with the kindred presentations of the later Apocrypha. In the Gospel of Thomas, as was observed, the resolution of Jesus is a far bolder one to start with; he turns back, from the journey, to Jerusalem; he strikes the teachers and elders speechless with amaze, while he solves the cardinal questions of the Law, and the symbolic discourses of the prophets; Mary is blessed, because these hoary greybeards have never seen, nor heard, such splendour, virtue and wisdom.† The Arabian Gospel of the childhood crowns all in fanciful extravagance by representing not only Law and Prophets, but even the obscure problem of the Messiah (as in Matt. xxii. 42) as lying clear before the eye of Jesus, who has read the whole Scripture, and puts to shame the scribes, by a complete understanding of it surpassing all creaturely intelligence: even astronomers, instructed in all the spheres of heaven, even philosophers, to whom the true principles of physics and metaphysics are now first imparted, sink in worship at his feet.‡ To place the simple beauty and just proportionment of Luke's account beneath the same sentence of condemnation, that were an act of critical cruelty and lust of mere destruction. Even Strauss knew how to discriminate here. To begin with such early maturity, especially in the East, where marriages are allowed at from twelve to fourteen years

* Others (*e.g.* Schenkel, Wittichen) would seek here no more than the ordinary filial consciousness common to Israel; but no Israelite claimed a special title of divine relationship, which yet is plainly expressed by the words: moreover, the above explanation has the facts of the subsequent life of Jesus in its favour.

† Thom. Ch. xix.: ἀποστομίζει τοὺς πρεσβ. κ. διδ. τ. λαοῦ, ἐπιλέων τὰ κεφάλαια τοῦ νόμου καὶ τὰς παραβολὰς τῶν προφητῶν.

‡ Ev. Inf. Arab. Ch. l.-liii.

of age, is by no means impossible. David exhibited the like, as, much later, did Herod the Great, while yet a schoolboy. The Tobite Hyrcanus in the time of the Ptolemies showed a pre-eminent intelligence and manly heroism which excited the envy of his brethren, in his thirteenth year. About his fourteenth year the historian Josephus claims to have already possessed such knowledge and insight, that as he quite coolly relates, high-priests and the first men of the city came daily in order to obtain from him an accurate decision on knotty points of Law. Again, he boasts how in his time, even the Jewish boys of Egypt (after the destruction of Jerusalem) refused, like heroic men, to suffer an acknowledgment of the Emperor as their master to be extorted from them.* Let us listen to Philo: Man when seven years old is a logician and a linguist; fourteen, a complete being, because then capable of becoming father of his like; when twenty-one, his growth and flower have reached their consummation. A son of five years, such is the plan of lessons given by Judas Ben Tema, shall proceed to the reading of the Scriptures, of ten to the Mishna, of thirteen to the Commandments, of fifteen to the Talmud, of eighteen to marriage.† Even the early maturity of Jesus' consciousness of God, at which Strauss takes offence, is rather postulated than negatived by the facts of his later life. There is no question of a superior wisdom that could brook no further instruction, nor of any sitting in the seats of the scribes.‡

* Jos. Ant. 15, 10, 5 (Herod): 12, 4, 6 (Hyrcanus): Vit. 2 (Josephus). Mariages: cf. the Legend of Mary, p. 73, again even for men 18, or actually as young as 13. The former P. A. next note: the latter according to present conditions in Tiberias (young husbands 13, young wives 11), Burckhardt, 570. Winer, Ehe. Boys in war, B. J. 7, 10, 1.

† Phil. Leg. Alleg. 42 (1) λογικὴ ἔξις (2) ἀκρῶς τελείωσις (3) πέραν αὐξήσεως, ἀκμή. Pirk. Aboth. 5, 21: idem (Jehuda filius Tema) dixit: filius quinque annorum ad biblia (mikra) destinietur. Filius decem annorum ad Mischna. Filius tredecim annorum ad Talmud. Filius octodecim annorum ad nuptias. Filius viginti annorum ad sectandum divitias. Filius triginta annorum ad robur, 40 prudentia, 50 concilium, 60 senectus, etc. Cf. Leusden, p. 87.

‡ Against Strauss p. 387 ff. Wisdom is spoken of only as in the case of Moses, Acts vii. 22.

Nor again must we on any account overlook the way in which side by side with this early ripeness stands childlike weakness and childlike subjection to the parent's will, and how the Evangelist himself with great emphasis places himself on the side of Jesus' gradual human development under human discipline. The real objections to the tale are at all events not fatal. True it is, amid the obscurity of Jesus' antecedents a longing could not but arise to enlighten that darkness by real, and still more by legendary histories of pregnant meaning, and the silence of the other Gospels favours this supposition in the case of the later Luke. True it is that antiquity and all time is fain to symbolize the place which great men take in the history of the world by heights of youthful attainment; witness Moses, Samuel, Solomon. Moses is marvellous even in his physical features, when only in his third year; Samuel the dweller in the Temple, is prophet from his thirteenth year; Samuel's history seems in fact to be just a model serving as a foundation for this story. (Luke ii. 52, 1 Samuel ii. 26).* Many points of detail too awake inquiry. The departure of careful parents without their dearest possession is not very easy to understand, that the son should simply have tarried behind and clung close to the Temple after a full week's stay, seems in the case of a lad who was nearing his spiritual maturity and of a nature at any rate in after time so inward in its tendency, and so alien from all externals, not easily explicable even from childlike *naïveté*, the only possible explanation; finally Mary's usurpation of authority overleaping that of the father, seems almost more intelligible from her place in history than from the nature of the case itself.

If these objections, especially the first, compel us to refrain from reckoning this story among the absolute certainties of the Gospels, yet are they not sufficient for its sheer overthrow. The parallel of Samuel does not go very deep. The behaviour

* Moses in Jos. Ant. 2, 9, 6. Sam. Ant. 5, 10, 4 (not then as Strauss has it 12th year), the phrase is *πεπληρωκώς ἔτος ἤδη δωδεκάτον*.

of the parents and of the son, may be psychologically justified ; Mary's forwardness in the presence of Joseph is possible, nay, historically likely. Finally, it does seem to us after all has been said, that this fine tender picture, in which neither truth to nature nor the beauty which that implies, is violated in a single line, in which youthful strivings in their truth and error alike, are drawn with such depth of meaning, picturing so completely beforehand the stages of his after life, cannot have been devised by human hands, which left to themselves were always betrayed into coarseness and exaggeration, as shown by the apocryphal Gospels, and even some stories of the youth of Old Testament heroes, — but only by true history, by this history of histories itself.

The accounts of the later Gospels must not be passed over by us. To the fact that the elder Gospels from the twelfth year downwards have nothing more to tell, men were fain to resign themselves : finding in this second and higher presentation in the Temple, the glory of Jesus arrived at such a height that the passage to his subsequent ministry appeared but a simple step. The Arabian Gospel of the Infancy, intensifying the story to the utmost, gives express prominence to the statement, that Jesus from this day on to his baptism concealed his wonders and confined himself henceforward to the study of the Law ; of which however he had been completely master already in Jerusalem, down to its profoundest mysteries.* Again, according to the Gnostic Justin, the decisive revelations of God fall in the twelfth year of Jesus.† But from the twelfth year backwards were found intolerable gaps. The higher nature of Jesus could not have lain so many years as a dead capital among mankind, without incurring suspicion as to its very existence : nay, in the human child it must have developed itself, or at least have cut short in him the usual human development. And this has become the chief point of interest :

* Ch. liv. cf. lii.

† Hippol. Philos. 5, 26.

from year to year, from the fourth to the eighth, finally, by a leap, to the twelfth year of his life, this development is narrowly followed, the very opposite of the human development in the third Gospel, a divine aboriginal superiority, not even growing, but at most, putting to shame successively the human stages of advancing years, and the educational appliances of the school. The child already is the man that is to be ; now and again is he typically so, appearing already in his youthful sports in the character of king and father ; as a sower he reaps a thousand bushels from one grain of wheat, from the biting demoniac Judas Iscariot drives out the devil in the shape of a dog ; or by his struggle with Annas the High-priest's boy, in a manner ushers in his subsequent conflict with his destined deadly foe : but mostly he is already his future self in fulness, the finished man, in wonders and discourses full of Johannine style, in healings on the Sabbath day, the subject of accusations and assaults, under stress of which the parents with their son journey from town to town in Galilee and Judæa.* Wonders and superhuman knowledge and foreknowledge surround him : intensified from the Gospel of Thomas downwards to "Matthew," till they finally reach the pitch of the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy. From his fourth year onwards in "Matthew," he raises the dead. He enters the lion's den near Jericho ; the lions worship him, and accompany him across the Jordan, which divides right and left at his approach.† But even Thomas gives us immediately on the entrance of Jesus upon his fifth year, twelve sparrows of clay, which learn to fly ; then raisings of the dead without number.‡ Many of these wonders are deeds of pity ; the wounded, the

* Playing at king, Ev. Ar. Ch. xli. Sower, Thom. xii. Judas, Ev. Ar. xxxv. Annas, Matt. xxviii. Johannine discourses, Matt. xxvi. xxx. Dispute about the Sabbath, xxvii. Change of abode: Galilee on the Jordan, Ch. xxvi. Nazareth, xxxii. Jericho, ib. Capernaum, xl. (propter malitiam hominum). Bethlehem, xli. A motley mass explicable only by the fourth Gospel.

† Matt. xxvi. xxxv. xxxvi. Cf. Exod. xiv. 29. Jos. iii. 13 ff. Isa. xliii. 20.

‡ Ch. ii. ix. x. xvii. xviii.

dying and the dead he hastens to help ; sends, too, his father Joseph forth to raise up a namesake ; the miraculous harvest he gives to the poor. A deed of love may also be an allowable term to apply to the lengthening of a bedstead, and the rectification of a king's throne in the workshop of his embarrassed father.* But others are mere wonders of display, as the sparrows. Worse still are the judgments dealt out in wrathful vengeance, the laming of hands, and slaying of men ; but worst of all refined, sometimes mischievous jokes. Even in the Gospel of Thomas one is strangely struck by Jesus clapping his hands to give wings to his clay sparrows, while Father Joseph is about to read him a lecture on his desecration of the Sabbath by working in clay ; but in the Arabic Gospel Jesus goes the length of throwing all the clothes of a dyer in a fit of frolic into the blue water, from which, it is true, he draws them all out again, coloured with the hues desired by the dismayed dyer ; or he changes his play-fellows in a game of hide-and-seek into leaping horned four-footed beasts, so that the women of the house repudiate their acquaintance under this goatish incognito ; though only for a time !†

The impression made by these wonders is accordingly not favourable even among contemporaries. It is true his fame flies to Jerusalem, to the high priest, throughout all Israel : but he is feared ; many complaints are brought to his home ; he has to be kept in the house, or led in the street : yet still revolt is ever threatening anew, the father is informed he can no longer be borne with in the place, or at least that he must teach him not to curse, but to bless.‡

Joseph himself grows desperate. "Know," says he to Mary, "my soul is troubled even unto death, by reason of this boy. It may yet happen, that one smite him in wrath, that he die." "Believe not, Man of God," answers Mary, "that that were possible. Believe of a surety that he who sent him

* Joseph, Matt. xl. Harvest, Thom. iv. Bedstead, xiii. Throne, Ev. A. xxxix.

† Ev. Ar. xxxvii. xl.

‡ Thom. iv. Matt. xxix.

to be born among men, will keep him from all malice, and preserve him from evil through his name.”*

The monstrosity of these tales, which, even in their glorification of their subject, make him inglorious, must needs be brought to a head in the portraiture of his family life and his attendance at school. In the Gospel of Thomas we still see some small amount of domestic discipline. Joseph ventures to rebuke him, and to take him by the ear, though not without Jesus exclaiming, “Thou hast not done wisely: grieve me not!” At least he dares to lead him, and to confine him in the house. Moreover, Jesus assists his mother as by fetching water, his father in the carpenter’s employ.

In “Matthew” Joseph ventures no longer to call his son to account, he imposes the responsibility on the mother, and she addresses him as “My Lord.” In family gatherings it was he that hallowed and blessed them, and till he began none ventured to eat and drink, to sit down, or to break bread: if he were absent, they waited his return. If he felt no desire for bodily sustenance, the whole family abstained. His brethren had his life as a lamp before their eyes; they honoured and feared him. How could it be otherwise, when even in his sleep, by day as well as by night, the glory of God shone round about him visibly.† His teachers would naturally have the hardest time of it. When the boy was five years old the scribe Zachæus first offered his services. He began with the Alphabet: but in a trice Jesus began also: “Thou who understandest not Alpha, nor its nature, how mayst thou teach Beta unto others? Thou hypocrite, first teach Alpha, when thou knowest it, then will we believe thee concerning Beta.” Then began he to put questions to him concerning Alpha, and when he perforce was silent he explained to him in the presence of all the mysteries of that letter; according to “Matthew;”

* Matt. xxxviii.

† Matt. xxvi. xlii. The ear, Thom. v. The behaviour at table is the travesty of that on p. 146 Note.

even his existence before the Law and before Abraham were. The old man bemoans his ruined reputation, acknowledges the antemundane (according to "Matthew" only the antediluvian) existence of his scholar, and begs Joseph to take his son, whose severe regard he could not bear, back home again.* He was now eight years old, and Joseph began to think he must, after all, leave him without instruction no longer; according to "Matthew," he gave in to the pressure of popular representations.

The second teacher began cautiously: he kept his patience, when the scholar persisted in giving him no answer. At last Jesus raised the old question: "If thou be really a teacher, tell me the meaning of Alpha, and I will tell thee that of Beta." Now anger seized the teacher, and he smote him on his head: but in a moment he sank upon the ground beneath the curse of Jesus. After some time a friend of Joseph's is willing to undertake the thankless task once more: he announces his intention of imparting instruction to his son by coaxing means. Jesus went joyously: but boldly seizing a book, instead of reading the letters, expounded the Law inspired by the Holy Ghost. At his wits' end the teacher cried to Joseph: "Take this child home: no pupil he,"—and Jesus went smilingly away, rewarding the soundness of his judgment by healing the former teacher.†

Enough of specimens from this history. For the historical Jesus there is nothing here to be looked for. An over-zealous belief in divine nature makes havoc of all human history, and dissolves all earthly order, even the holy and inviolable laws of moral growth and domestic conduct and discipline, in sport and mockery and scorn, the impression of which is not removed by this jaunty overthrow of human nature, nor its effect improved by such emphatic manifestation of divine glory. It was not

* Thomas, vi. vii. cf. Irenæus (1, 20, 1, on the Marcosians) and other Fathers, Matt. xxx. xxxi.

† Thom. xiv. xv. Mt. xxxviii. xxxix.

without its uses that we should behold these consequences, and listen to the utterances of a piety, which in our day we no longer understand.

The precious notices of the youth of Jesus in the third Gospel, will always, must always remain the foundations of our investigations into the development of Jesus, the more so as the genuinely human conception of the Evangelist, puts ancient and modern dreams to shame, and from that distant time joins friendly hands with the latest views of the subject; but they do not absolve us from the task, but rather ever impose it afresh, of crowning this firm groundwork by unravelling the growth of Jesus by dint of the means which the history of the time, and the later facts of this life supply; in so far as from both points of view conjectures as to what was likely beforehand and inferences of what must have happened either of binding force, or at least of that persuasive power which reaches the level of likelihood, admit of being formed.*

A genuinely human life, in the sense of Luke, is not brought to pass without the most manifold impulses from without, even though perhaps the individual force which the person himself contributes, and adds as a link in the historical sequence, may transcend the whole sum of those influences, reduce them to subjection, or at least, lay hold of some, and put aside others in the spirit of a free eclecticism, in order to become itself the great power of the age, to which all that is spiritually alive and active must come for instruction. The external impulse is after all ever the first inducement and incentive, which stirs the genius within to gentle motion and courageous flight, and ever too leads it onward to further enrichments and profounder depths; indeed genius itself cannot be seized and comprehended in its essential manifestation and the natural depth of its origi-

* Quite in conformity with Luke is Justin, Tryph. 88. *γεννηθεὶς δύνανται αὐτοῦ ἔσχεν καὶ αὐξάνων κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν πάντων ἀνθρώπων χρώμενος τοῖς ἀρμόζουσιν, ἐκίστη αὐξήσει τὸ οἰκεῖον ἀπένειμε τρεφόμενος τὰς πάσας τροφάς. κ.τ.λ.*

nality, until first the more easily intelligible and better known strata of the time's surroundings, which have enwrap the hidden presence, have been separated from the ore of its individuality.

Certain it is, to start with, that Jesus in Nazara, in the parental house of Joseph and Mary, and in the midst of a circle of a fairly numerous and spiritually gifted world of brothers and sisters, received his earliest simple culture and education.* The Gospels mention four brothers of Jesus, and some sisters whose number is not given. The four brothers were called according to Matthew, James, Joseph, Simon, and Judas. In place of the second name appears, from Mark onwards until the Arabic Gospel, the shortened form Joses, in several MSS. of Matthew a John, in later writers (History of Joseph) even a Justus; and little attested as the name is, in several MSS. of the Gospel of James a Samuel. We must here hold fast to the best accredited text of the first Gospel, especially as the names Joses and Justus, who again is the same as James the Just, are doubtless bound up with the desire to connect (or confound) the brethren of Jesus with cousins and Apostles of like name.† For the names and number of the sisters there was ample room for the freest play of later fancy. From two to three were generally received, but for these was found a whole list of names: Anna, Assia, Esther, Lydia, Mary, Salome, Thamar.‡

* On the simplicity of the external life of the Jews even in Alexandria, so far as sitting room and kitchen went (where there was scarcely a knife), see Phil. Flacc. 977, f. As a man of high mental gifts appears James, cf. p. 33.

† Matt. xiii. 55. Mark vi. 3. For the readings in both see Tischendorf. Best vouched for is in Matthew Joseph, in Mark Joses. Sinait. has Joseph in Matthew and Mark. Tischend. conjectures, however, that in Sin. the original reading was that elsewhere occurring *Ἰωάννης*. The cousins, Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40. Apostles, Matt. x. 2, 3. Pseudomatt. followed Matt. ch. xlii. Ev. Arab. ch. xxxv. has Joses in agreement with Mark. The name Justus (which must simply be understood as a well-known surname of James, on which account also the other James always appears as Jacobus minor), Hist. Jos. ii. xi. ch. ii.: Judas, Justus, Jacobus (ch. xi.: minor) et Simon. The elders (*seniores*) according to ch. xi. Justus and Simon. Samuel in MSS. of the Ev. Jac. xvii.

‡ Mary and Salome, Epiph. Hær. 28. 7. Esther, Thamar, Salome, Sophron. Fragm. Assia, Lydia, Hist. Jos. ii. Cf. Hofmann, p. 4.

Of more weight is the question whether these were full brothers and sisters of Jesus. The Gospels leave no doubt on this head; to begin with, the stories of the childhood favour this opinion, inasmuch as they allow us to infer the subsequent birth of children from the marriage of Joseph with Mary; and in the later history of Jesus, the brothers and sisters appear in the closest blood relationship now with Jesus, now with Joseph and Mary. Paul too, and the Acts as well, admit no other judgment.* True, as early as the middle of the second century, the Palestinian Hegesippus and Clement after him preferred to think of cousins, rather than real brothers and sisters of Jesus.†

And simultaneously, likewise in honour of Mary's virginity, the opinion arose, as expressed in later Jewish-Christian Gospels, in that of Peter, in that of James, still more in the more recent History of Joseph, that the brothers and sisters in question were from the first marriage of Joseph the aged widower.‡ Such a view was favourably received, even Origen and Eusebius espoused it, while afterwards Jerome and Augustine, who were authorities with many, inclined anew to the ancient and still purer opinion that the "brethren" were only cousins of Jesus.§ If in this question, following the precedent of Herder, and in later times, even of Hofmann, Laurent, and Pressensé, we may

* Matt. i. 25; Luke ii. 7: *πρωτότοκον*. Matt. xii. 46, xiii. 55, 56. Mark iii. 31, vi. 3. 1 Cor. ix. 5. Gal. i. 19. Acts i. 14. Even the later Gospel of the Hebrews has still simply *Jac. frater*. Jer. V. I. 2.

† Heg. brings James and Symeon, of whom he calls the former the brother of Jesus, into the relation of *ἀνεψιοί* to Jesus: they were the sons of Clopas, Joseph's brother, the uncle of Jesus. Cf. especially Eus. 3, 11, 32. 4. 22. Also 2, 23. 3, 20. Credner Einl. 575, explains 4, 22, quite falsely (James, Jesus' real brother). See the passage 3, 32, Clem. a. Eus. 2, 1.

‡ Origen on Matt. xiii. 55, mentions the Gospels of Peter and James, and he himself assents in the interests of the virginity; in Credner, Beiträge, 1, 401. Einl. 573 ff. Anger, Synops. 272. With Orig. go Hil. Ambr. Epiph. Gr. Nyss. With Jerome, Chrys. Theod. cf. Credner loc. cit. Hofmann, p. 4. Ev. Jac. ix. Hist. Jos. ch. ii.

§ Eus. 2, 1. 3, 32. Jer. c. Helvid. 7. on Matt. xii. 46. Cf. last Note. Proofs were supplied by Matt. xxvii. 56. Gal. i. 19, &c. Further details under the head of "the Apostles."

quietly allow the Gospels to decide, on the other hand the certainly subordinate question as to the relative age of Jesus in the circle of his brothers and sisters is now beyond reach of solution.* The later Gospels have, of course, from the point of view of their assumptions, regarded Jesus as the youngest in the family circle. They disagree at most, if at all, as to which were the elder and which the younger of Joseph's sons. James or Justus appears in the later Matthew, as in the History of Joseph, as the eldest. As the second this History names Simon, who like James and the two sisters is said to have married betimes, while the two younger brothers, Judas and James the younger, still remained at home. On the contrary, the later Matthew, in agreement with our own, placed Joseph along with James at the head.† If we go back to the old Gospels, there is no doubt that they make out the brothers and sisters of Jesus to be children of the subsequent marriage of Joseph and Mary, in which statement Matthew and Mark only differ in that one places the two youngest sons third, the other fourth.‡ But just with respect to the principal point, the question whether or not Jesus were the first-born, in which they so flatly contradict the unhistorical accounts of the later Gospels, a decisive conclusion is precluded by the fact that it is in virtue of a legendary story that Jesus is represented, not only as the first-born, but as a son before marriage. What matter these obscurities at bottom? What matter these externals? What finally would it matter, whether we thought of the education of Jesus as altogether locally tied to Nazara, or were to believe with the later Matthew (in modern times with Ewald too) in family wanderings? Yet the unbridled fancy of this Gospel is shipwrecked on our elder Gospels, which visibly presuppose the permanence of the abode in Nazara, thus justifying at the same time our own prejudice, that for the restful, still un-

* Cf. Laurent. Neutest. Stud. 1866, p. 153 ff. Pressensé, Jésus Christ, p. 287.

† Hist. Jos. ii. xi. Mt. ch. xli. xlii.

‡ Matt. xiii. 55. Mark vi. 3.

folding of such a Personality, the fixed and rural habitation of the parents in Galilee would be the proper place.

How was Jesus brought up? The bringing up of youth was among the Israelites, both by law and custom, almost exclusively confided to the parents as a sacred trust. To begin with, far otherwise than among Greeks and Romans, the Old Testament had bound together parents and children. The religious sense of the people saw in the children, notably in the male posterity as the bearers of the name, the perpetuators of the family—the blessing of God; in childlessness the curse and the wrath of heaven.* By these principles the way was opened as much for the full current of humanity and love between parents and children, the exact reverse of the heathen right and custom of slaying, exposing, and neglecting their offspring, as on the other hand for the religious nurture of the children in honour of the Supreme Owner of Family and Nation, who, in the succession of the generations which he fostered and in their pious fidelity, also built up his own glory. Often enough, therefore, did the Lawgiver inculcate upon parents, most of all upon fathers, the duty of instructing the children at home, at the board, and by the way, concerning the holy ordinances and wondrous deeds of God; yes, God himself foresees in Abraham the man who is to commend to his children and to his house after him the ways of the Lord, that so the promises may come to their fulfilment.† The obverse of this was for the children the command to honour their parents. It stood in the Law next after the duties towards God. Father and mother are the earthly representatives of the majesty of God. Obedience has God's blessing; for rebellion the sacred ordinance even fixes

* Cf. only the mother of Samuel, 1 Sam. i. 5 ff. Ps. cxiii. 9, cxxviii. 3 ff. Isa. xlix. 21, xlvii. 9. Winer, Real-Wört. A. Kinder.

† Gen. xviii. 19. Ex. xii. 26 f., xiii. 8, 14 f. Deut. vi. 7, 20, xi. 19. Cf. on the sanctification of the table (as among the Essenes) Rabbi Symeon: tres qui edunt in una mensa neque loquuntur in ea verba legis, perinde est ac si comedissent de sacrificiis mortuorum (opp. : ac si comedissent de mensa ipsius Dei), P. A. 3, 3.

the penalty of death.* Down to the time of Jesus, especially in the book of Sirach, these foundation stones of Israelitish household and communal life are ever laid afresh, and it will be admitted, the Old Testament is full of proofs of touching piety in family life ; this is a virtue possessed by even Herod, who loved his parents and his brothers and sisters ; nay, it is an ornament of Israel to this day.† In Jesus' time, too, these ordinances were in force ; and Greece and Rome had nothing to equal them, or with which they could be compared. Sumptuous banquets in celebration of children's birthdays, says Josephus, were not allowed by Moses ; but on the other hand he ordained side by side with the first simple food which they could take, instruction in the Scriptures, conduct conformable to the Law, and acquaintance with the deeds of their fathers : the latter they were to emulate, the former to take in with their mother's milk, that they might neither transgress the commandments, nor excuse themselves from obeying them on plea of ignorance. Honour for parents he placed next to honour for God, in the second place : him, who made no return for the proofs of their affection, he gives over to be stoned. Josephus boasts too of the fulfilment of the command. Most of all, he says, seek we our honour and the highest end of life, in the bringing up of our children, and the observance of the commandments. From the first dawn of consciousness we forthwith learn the laws with accurate care, and hence have them as it were engraved upon the soul ; therefore are transgressions rare ; therefore even among slaves and women is the conviction clear, that the whole life must ring out in piety.‡

In this great school of obedience to parents and instruction in the Law, first of all in teaching and learning by word of mouth, as presupposed in the Old Testament, Jesus, to begin with, grew up. For his pious nurture the character of the

* Exod. xx. 12, cf. Sir. iii. 6. Exod. xxi. 15. 17. Lev. xx. 9.

† Sir. ch. iii.

‡ Joseph. c. Apion. 2, 25. 27. 1, 8. 12. 2, 18. 19.

house, still more than Josephus, can answer; most of all, Jesus himself, as he afterwards appears in his all-embracing knowledge of the Scriptures and in his spotless purity of morals. The story of the boy of twelve confirms the same, and enriches us furthermore with the knowledge that there were not wanting to this bringing up a rising scale of incentives to piety, observant allowance for individual nature, and intelligent tolerance of the beginnings of independence. And yet beyond the limits of this story, the ripe-grown man, with all the freshness of his originality, with all the joyousness and unbroken truth to Nature of his religion, and his whole spiritual being, will afford a living and a moving proof that no kind of domestic pressure from without or from within, no gloomy, bending, and embittering discipline could have ruled his early years, and that a youth made happy by parental leading and lowly childlike following was the bright horizon that bounded the background of his conscious reminiscence. The child the nearest to the kingdom of heaven, the father weaponless against the child's earnest prayer, are not these sayings of Jesus leaves from his own childhood's heaven? Even the sports of his youth, with their harmless precocities, dances and disagreements, he seems still to hold in pleasant remembrance.*

There are no traces of the education of Jesus having been too exclusively the work of Mary. In reality, according to the Old Testament and the Rabbis, the father was always first called to the task. Even the story of the first journey to the feast gives no denial to this view. The Apocrypha give Joseph a part in the training, and according to the History of Joseph, he did not die till about the nineteenth year of Jesus' life.† Our Gospels too indicate at most that Joseph lived no longer

* Cf. sayings like Matt. xix. 13-15, xi. 16. Humility, cf. xi. 29. The child-like obedience is seen accurately pictured: *transegi omnem ætatem meam sine culpa neque repugnaui illis unquam nec iram illis concitavi ullo die aut verbum aliquod opposui (ut facere solent reliqui quos terra producit homines).* Hist. Joseph. xi.

† Ch. xiv. xv.

when Jesus was a man; and one of these Gospels favours the presumption that, as other later accounts teach, Jesus followed his father in his worldly calling.* We are not, for all that, to curtail the mother's part in the work, as represented even at that very time and in the Old Testament, where indeed, by the position of equality assigned to the parents, it was hallowed in the eyes of the child.† The history of the time moreover affords instances of eminent and highly cultured women, as the relative of Eleazar, a worthy descendant of Judas the Galilæan.‡ Should it seem probable that the anticipation of the father by the mother, when the son's lengthened sojourn at the feast is criticized, is bound up with the legendary prerogatives of Mary in the matter of the birth, yet to begin with we have won greater confidence in this tale; and if, to conclude, we take counsel of the subsequent narrative, we are compelled by that train of spiritual affinity between mother and son, which even in the midst of manifest disagreement was so vividly and so beautifully prolonged, to believe in the mother's powerful influence early in the course of her son's development, which must have been fertilized by her feeling and by her intelligence.

It has been asked whether Jesus, along with his parental training, enjoyed the advantage of a school? The wonder of his native place, as to whence his wisdom came, and the scornful cry of the Jews concerning his self-taught learning in the Scriptures, only prove in themselves that Jesus never attended a superior school, above all such a one as would afford that knowledge of the Scriptures which found favour at Jerusalem.§ But did he not perhaps learn in an inferior

* Mark vi. 3, cf. Matt. xiii. 55. Luke iv. 22. Only Mark favours the assumption that Joseph was dead at the time of Jesus' first ministry. The later non-mention of Joseph in the Gospels may have other grounds. Matt. xii. 46, alone is enough to enable us to guess them.

† Cf. 1 Sam. i. 2. Prov. xxxi. 1, xix. 26. xxiii. 22. Sirach iii. 1 ff. vii. 29 f. Susann. iii. Luke i. 6. 2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 15. The mother of Jesus, p. 33.

‡ B. J. 7, 9. 1: φρονήσει καὶ παιδείᾳ πλειστῶν γυναικῶν διαφέρουσα.

§ Matt. xiii. 54. Mark vi. 2. John vii. 15.

school the elements of knowledge, and especially the reading of the Scriptures? Traces of schools and of teachers in Israel we certainly have reaching a good way back.

Not to speak of the teachers and tutors of the princes and grandees, such as were Nathan for Solomon, Andromachus and Gemellus for the sons of Herod the Great, such as also Josephus kept for his son, in the person of a slave and an eunuch; we find on the very threshold of the second century B.C. the Tobite Josephus who sends his sons to the most famous teachers, and half a century before Christ, King Herod that was to be, wending his way to school in Jerusalem.* But in both cases we should in all likelihood take them to be Greek schools, such as the Jewish historian assumes elsewhere also, but such as would hardly exist in Nazara.† The Talmud indicates, no doubt, that in later times there was no want of Jewish schools, and even school regulations, and that in particular various Sopherim, as well as the Chassanim (overseers, rector) of the synagogues were employed as private teachers, and teachers of small children (*mikredardike* = *mikrodidactici*): but the accounts in the Talmudic tract Baba Bathra, of the development of the Jewish school system, show plainly that after all, even though Ezra is named as the one who threw open competition to teachers of the young without let or hindrance, yet in the time of Jesus the school question must still have been in a very bad way.‡

We are here reminded that in Israel, according to Deut. xi. 19, it was in the first instance the father who conducted the son's education. The fatherless, we are told, went empty away. This evil condition of things necessitated schools: first in Jerusalem: but now the fatherless still did not attend: afterwards in all parts of the land; but the youths of sixteen, whom they summoned to these schools, ran off again amid the

* 2 Sam. xii. 25. Jos. Ant. 16, 8, 3. Vit. 76. Ant. 12, 4, 6. 15, 10, 5.

† Ant. 20, 11, 2.

‡ Gemar. Baba Bathra, f. 21. 1. Cf. Gfrörer. Jahrh. des Heils, p. 186 f. Herzfeld, 3, 243, 268. Winer, Art. Unterricht. Hofmann, L. J. nach den Apokr. p. 216.

blows they received there. At last Jesus the son of Gamaliel won the immortal credit of being instrumental in the establishment of places of instruction in every province and town, and that for children of the early age of 6-7. Hence we may distinguish three several starts in the organisation of schools: the first however only touched Jerusalem, the second was not successful, and even such as it was probably lay below the time of Jesus; the third and happier attempt under the high-priest Jesus (64-66) dated only a short time before the destruction of Jerusalem.* For any school education of Jesus in the little out of the way town of Nazara there are therefore no reliable data, unless we are to believe the Apocrypha. It is not impossible,—inasmuch as Nazara possessed a synagogue,—that Jesus obtained from the rulers of that synagogue an exceptional and early course of instruction, but it is still more likely that he first learnt to read the Scripture from his father and mother. That he did learn the Scripture not only by hearing, but also by reading it, we have cogent proof, not only in the inaugural discourse in Nazara, or in the mention of Hebrew letters: the accurate knowledge of the Scripture, which gave him the right to designate himself along with his disciples as a “Scribe,” and the frequent controversial retort which put to shame the adverse Scribes, “have ye never read?” is the clinching argument.† The skill of Jesus as a penman, which besides was of no moment in his calling, is perhaps less easily substantiated, unless one takes refuge in the fictitious correspondence ascribed to him: yet one who read the manuscripts of the Bible, and that in the modern Assyrian form (as is very likely), and who kept present to his imagination its letters large and small with their little hooks and rings, must most probably also have been able to write, especially as the mere requirements of life in the way of drawing up all kinds

* Jos. Ant. 20, 9, 4. 7. Immediately afterwards, under his successor Matthias Theophili, began the war with the Romans, ib.

† Luke iv. 17 ff. Matt. v. 18. Have ye not read? Matt. xii. 3. xix. 4. xxi. 16, 42. xxii. 31. Scribe, xiii. 52.

of contracts would often enough demand the practice of the art.*

For the rest, everything compels us to speak only of Hebrew, not of Greek writing. The Apocrypha true enough have fabled both of the Hebrew and the Greek alphabet, indeed the Gospel of Thomas gives Greek the precedence.† We may assume that Jesus to some extent (more cannot be believed after the notices in Josephus) could speak Greek, which in Galilee was natural enough; in this way we can the better understand his intercourse with non-Israelites generally and Pilate in particular. As for preaching in Greek on that account, as Hug imagined, that by no means follow, and just as little did he preach in Aramaic, the language of the land, *only* because the people liked to hear it.‡ But that he read Greek, or actually Latin, of that there is simply not a trace. To judge of the inscription on the Roman coin there was no need of Latin or Greek knowledge.§

Further, the interesting question whether Jesus read the Scripture in the Greek translation rather than in the Hebrew text must be answered in the negative. Doubtless it has been before now maintained, that the old Hebrew of the Bible had become a dead unintelligible tongue to the Jews of that time, who spoke Aramaic: that only the Scribes could still read it: that the people were pointed to the Greek translation if they wished to study the Scripture for themselves.|| This view is altogether at variance with the Jewish regard for the sacred relics of their country, and with their dislike to the Greek, of which even Paul was aware (Acts xxi. 40), yes, to the Greek

* John viii. 6, no proof, but cf. Matt. v. 18. This passage proves also that in the time of Jesus the new Assyrian writing (instead of the old Hebræo-Phœnician) was in vogue. Cf. Winer, *Schreibkunst*.

† Ch. xiv. : *παιδεύσω τὰ ἑλληνικά, ἔπειτα τὰ ἰβραϊκά*.

‡ Cf. Jos. Ant. 20, 11, 2. Also 12, 47 : *πρὸς τὰς τοιαύτας συνουσίας ἀγροικότερον ἔχιν φησάντων*. On the other hand, Hug, Einl. in's N. T. 4th Ed. 2, 44 f.

§ Matt. xxii. 19.

|| Bleek, Einl. ins N. T. p. 53. Bertheau in Herzog's Enc. V. 620.

translation itself which found only slow acceptance ; at variance too with the linguistic fact that to go back from the Aramaic dialect to the nearly cognate Ancient Hebrew was a hundredfold easier for the Jews, than to have recourse to the Greek.* Add to this the express statement, that even the proselytes of the Jews learned their sacred language : Izates the prince of Assyrian Adiabene, under Caius Claudius, sent his five sons to Jerusalem to acquire accurately the language and culture of the country.† As to Jesus, he afterwards not only spoke Aramaic but rendered the Scripture in Aramaic with slight alteration from the Hebrew, and what is of more weight, he disputed times out of number with the Scribes concerning the word of Scripture, whose authority for them, and we may believe for him too, lay solely in the original text.‡ The only fact that would seem to speak for an employment of the Greek version, is that the scriptural quotations made by Jesus in our Gospels are taken in the majority of cases from the text of that translation. He who would argue like a child, must come to the conclusion, that Jesus mostly had recourse to the Greek, but now and then to the Hebrew. But these Scripture citations, as regards their definite linguistic garb, belong altogether to the Evangelists as such.§

This Hebrew text and not the Greek it must have been which the parents of Jesus also would best have understood, read and taught. It was quite in keeping with the whole character of Jewish reverence for the Law, that pious parents should themselves have a manuscript of the Law, and that in the ancient sacred language. As early as the age of the Hasmonæans

* Cf. besides Ant. 20. 11, 2, and the necessity for even Symeon, son of Gamaliel, to stand up for the Greek (Lightf. 253), page 292, Vol. I. in this book.

† Ant. 20, 3, 4.

‡ Matt. v. 22, xxvii. 46. xxvi. 73. Mark v. 41. vii. 11, 34. xiv. 36. xv. 34. A trace of Aramaic colouring in the Hebrew text, Mark xv. 34, along with Matt. xxvii. 46. The preference for the Hebrew text among scribes is seen still in Paul who, although a Hellenist, well understood Hebrew.

§ The blending of the Hellenistic and Hebraizing mode of citation in the Gospels belongs to the questions of the Introduction to the Gospels. Cf. Vol. I. p. 83 ff.

there were a number of MSS. in private possession, and the rage of the Syrian King, who was for hellenizing the Jews, was specially levelled against these writings, which like those of the Christians in later times under the Emperor Diocletian were torn and burnt.* It is not likely that the employment of these documents in houses should be afterwards more rare, rather would it continually increase under the exertions of the Scribes and Pharisees, if only as the symbol of resistance to the intrusion of foreign culture. Though, no doubt, considerable wealth was implied in the possession of a complete copy of the Old Testament in parchment or Egyptian papyrus, yet the Law, a Prophet, or a Psalter might adorn even a modest house, and single passages from the Law written on the door-posts and on slips of parchment, the "mementos," Tephillim, phylacteries, were to be found probably in every house, in accordance with the letter of Moses and the customs of post-exilic times. According to the Talmud rolls were given into the hands of children on which weighty portions of the Old Testament were marked.†

The religious teaching in the parents' house was supplemented for Jesus in the synagogue, to which he was admitted when five or six years old, and which from his thirteenth year, as "Son of the Law," he was bound to attend.‡ Instead of the hasty curiosity which fancied all possible ways in which Jesus might have been educated, the boundless significance of this actual and really conceivable means of education, this weightiest and perhaps, along with domestic training and Scripture instruction, this only school

* 1 Macc. i. 59, 60. Joseph. Ant. 12, 5, 4.

† Cf. Deut. vi. 9. Exod. xiii. 9 ff. Deut. vi. 8. xi. 18. Jos. Ant. 4, 8, 13. On the door stood, Deut. vi. 4, 5. On the strips, Deut. xi. 13-22. vi. 4-10. Exod. xiii. 11-17. 1-11. Cf. Winer, Art. Phylakterien, Häuser. The rolls of children with scheme or Hallel, the story of the Creation to the Flood, and Lev. i.-viii. in Herzfeld, 3, 267. Cf. also p. 146, Note.

‡ Juda Ben Tema Pirk. Ab 5, 21 : filius quinque annorum ad biblia (mikra). Already Simeon Ben Shetach is said to have required the attendance of children at the house of instruction ; later (or first ?) Josua Ben Gamla. Herzfeld, 3, 251 f.

for higher learning enjoyed by Jesus, should never in the first place have been overlooked. Although we have no accounts of this school for Jesus, yet may it be counted among the most undoubted facts in his life: it is vouched for by general custom and by the Law, by the Temple visit in Jerusalem, and by the later habit of Jesus of going to the Synagogue, and laying there the foundations of his own teaching.

The Synagogues or places of religious assembly (in Hebrew, *Beth-keneset*, *Beth-tephilla*, *Moed-el*, House of Assembly, House of Prayer, House of God: in Greek, *Synagogé* and *Proseuché*) were among the fruits of the Exile, which robbed the people of the Temple, and in exchange gave occasion to the need for religious confederation, acquaintance with the Law, and faithful observance of the same. Later Jews, indeed, sought the Synagogue already among the patriarchs.* During the time of banishment itself these assemblies may have had their rise. After the return, the Law was read assiduously by Ezra in presence of all the people, and explained to them.† What began in Jerusalem was all the surer to go the round of the whole land; because it held good for all; because it needed no place for sacrifice; and even in Jerusalem was not absolutely confined to the Temple. Doubtless, as aforetime the Prophets, so too Ezra and his followers chose by preference the forecourts and halls of the Temple as the place in which to expound the Law; and the Temple Synagogue became in course of time the most illustrious; yet even in the days of Ezra other places of resort were employed. We have an incidental trace for the first time, with any certainty, of a Synagogue, in the second century B.C., under the Syrian kings, who we are told paid regard to the great Synagogue in Antioch.‡ In the time of Jesus they were to be found in all

* Herzfeld, 1, 25 ff. 2, 391 ff. 3, 129. 183. 226. Art. Synagoge, in Winer and Herzog. Also Lightf. p. 278 ff. Cf. the remarkable Ps. lxxiv. 8: *kol moade-el baarets*: all God's gatherings in the land. Hitzig, too, Psalms II., 136, here thinks of the synagogues of the Maccabæan age.

† Neh. viii. 1-18. ix. 1 ff.

‡ Jos. B. J. 7, 3, 2.

places of any importance, both at home and abroad, where Jews dwelt; in Nazara and Capernaum, as well as in Ephesus, Corinth, and Athens. Towns like Damascus, Alexandria, even Rome with its recent Jewish colony, had several; Tiberias in the latter days of its glory thirteen, Jerusalem actually from four hundred and sixty to four hundred and eighty.* The Synagogue was in a manner a copy of the Temple, and claimed even the sanctity of the latter. The Jews loved to make sure of a site for it in the neighbourhood of pure and purifying water, in an elevated and commanding position; and there is nothing to hinder us from assuming the latter in the case of Nazara.†

The building and decoration were occasionally on a large and splendid scale, as in Antioch and in the chief synagogue of Alexandria. The Temple-synagogue too in Jerusalem, and the House of Prayer (*Proseuché*) in Tiberias, and in Sichem, are also described as of considerable extent. Frequently these buildings are called basilicas, or compared with such: accordingly we must think of colonnades, inclosing a roofed oblong, and most likely in general surrounded by walls: at the same time Epiphanius, a late writer however, calls the *Proseuché* of Sichem theatre-like and open above.‡

The inside in later times represented in a manner the forecourts and the temple; in the lower space in front sat men and women, doubtless everywhere severed from each other by partitions, just as among Philo's *Therapeutæ*: on the dais was the pulpit,—this in the middle,—the reader's desk, and perhaps also the place of honour for the rulers of the synagogue; behind in the direction of Jerusalem the holy chest, the miniature temple, with its rolls of the law, and its curtain, the

* Matt. xiii. 54. Luke iv. 31 ff. Acts xvii. 17. xviii. 4. xix. 8. Damascus in Acts ix. 2. 20. Similarly, Salamis in Cyprus, xiii. 5. Rome Phil. Leg. ad Caj. p. 1014. Alexandria in Flacc. 971 ff. Besides see Leyrer, Herzog, xv. 300.

† Cf. Luke iv. 29. Acts xvi. 13. Phil. in Flacc. 982.

‡ Cf. Jos. B. J. 7, 3, 3. Vit. 54. Epiph. Hær. 80, 1. Herzfeld, &c.

model of the ark of the covenant, and the Holy of Holies.* Men were counselled, to attend daily at the Synagogue the three hours of prayer, which replaced the three daily oblations: he who went to the Synagogue was redeeming Israel from the heathen! Expositions of the Law took place chiefly on the Sabbaths and Feast Days, besides on Mondays and Thursdays, the days of the markets and assizes, as well as of the Pharisaic fasts.† To the prayers, which were performed standing and in the vernacular of the land, was added the reading of a portion of the Law, or at other times of the prophets (*Parashe, Haphthare*); the reader (*Turgman*) was followed by the expounder (*Darshan*), a man skilled in the Scripture; the office being filled in turn by one or another of the elders or rulers of the synagogue, or a member of the assembly called up for the purpose; and by strangers as well as men of the place.‡

The afterwards fixed ordinances of the rabbinical time can scarcely thus be taken for granted, it must be owned, as a matter of course from the first: yet Philo and the New Testament on the whole agree in these fundamental features. The speaker expounded the Law in its detail and its entirety, the one rather as a literalist, the other as an exhorter to righteousness, the third as a profound allegorist: yet none, we may believe, without somehow satisfying the three cardinal requirements of Egyptian piety, Love to God, Love to Virtue, Love to mankind, a love which in the synagogue itself found practical expression in a collection of alms for the land of Israel.§ In the afternoon there was another gathering, for the further reading of a smaller portion, a

* Phil. Vit. Cont. p. 894 (men and women).

† Cf. Phil. Leg. ad. Caj. 1014, on the Roman Colony: *ἡπίστατο* (Augustus) οὖν καὶ προσευχὰς ἔχοντας καὶ συνιόντας εἰς αὐτὰς καὶ μάλιστα ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἐβδόμαις, ὅτε δημοσίᾳ τὴν πάτριον παιδεύονται φιλοσοφίαν. Bab. Berac. f. 8, 1: quicunque erat cum synagoga, reputo ego de eo ac si me filiosque meos redimeret a nationibus mundi.

‡ Phil. d. sept. et fest. 1178: τῶν ἱερέων δέ τις ὁ παρὼν ἢ τῶν γερόντων εἰς ἀναγινώσκει τοὺς ἱεροὺς νόμους αὐτοῖς καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐξηγεῖται μέχρι σχεδὸν δέιλης ὀψίας. q. omn. prob. 1, 877: ἕτερος (than the reader) τῶν ἐμπειροτάτων, &c. Cf. Luke iv. 16. Acts xiii. 15.

§ Cf. Phil. q. o. p. l. 877.

gathering often prolonged by lamplight into dusk.* The assembly listened noiselessly, only emphasizing the prayers with its Amen. Interruption was forbidden; but among Orientals it was inevitable that approval or disapproval should be now and then betokened by a sign, that agreement or contradiction should be expressed aloud; yes, even the speaker ordered to hold his peace.†

In this synagogue, at the feet of the elders, Jesus too sat.‡ Here first he learned to love the fellowship of Israel, heard of the rights, the duties, and the prospects of the expectant people of God, and enriched himself with a deeper knowledge of the Law in its connected sequence. The synagogue by which Israel was weaned from material sacrifice to spiritual worship, bade simultaneously for his attachment to a higher religion, as well as for his zeal on behalf of ancient rites. For one cannot be wrong in assuming that the exposition which Jesus would there most often have heard, was that of the Scribes' prevailing learned petrifications with a Pharisaic colouring: indicating as do his subsequent utterances, that he had often enough met with Scribes and Pharisees in the synagogues, now challenging attention by the ostentation of their prayers and their alms, now pressing to the first benches, the seats of honour, where they would be most likely called upon to speak. Even so his disciples bear in remembrance their Pharisaic expounders and teachers, who for these children of the people existed only in the synagogue.§ Doubtless even with them there was something to be learnt, and the general judgment of the people themselves would commend them to his best attention. Here was accurate exposition, here at the same time the Law was supplemented, here resounded the great lessons of purity, and

* Phil. d. Sept. 1178.

† Phil. loc. cit. Lightf. 281: *obmurmuravit totus cœtus et dixit interpreti: tace et tacuit.* (Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 30.) Further Matt. xiii. 54 ff. Acts xviii. 6.

‡ Phil. q. o. p. l. 877: *καθ' ἡλικίας ἐν τάξεσιν ὑπὸ πρεσβυτέροις νότοι καθίζουσιν.* James ii. 2-3.

§ Matt. vi. 2. 5. xxiii. 6. xvii. 10 (the Apostles).

righteousness of deed, of the Kingdom of God, and the coming redemption of Israel. We shall see that he learned much from them, either to retain or to cast away. At the same time it was the privilege of his Israelitish youth to make their acquaintance in the persons of various representatives, each of peculiar hue, probably too the difference between the rigour of a Shammai and the mildness of a Hillel, Jewish severity and Galilæan freedom and tolerance; and again to hear, side by side with them, others of divergent views, if not exactly Sadducees, whose fundamental ideas he would know beforehand from the Pharisees themselves, yet likely enough Essenes, or those allied to them in spirit.* It would indeed be perverse to believe in the living and multiform religious movements among Israel in those days, and at the same time to think of them as excluded from the central point of religious life, the life in the synagogue. Even the Essenism one must not regard as the puritan satiety of a Hermit, in face of the currents of popular life, since it was by no means so *entirely secluded*; and even the history of the Judæism of the day and of the earliest Christianity proves the notable circulation of Essenian thoughts in wide extended circles. How natural, too, is it to think that attendance at the synagogue became gradually, in Jesus' case, the point of contact for the most various personal intercourse with the mass of the people, with the free, straightforward men of Galilee, as well as with the admirers of the Pharisees, and haply too with the teachers of the synagogue themselves. The East with its love of speech, its publicity of life, and its happy absence of the restraints of social class, implied this as its natural consequence: but we can actually see the fresh outbursts of feeling and judgment in the synagogues, we can see in the later life of Jesus himself the conversations and reflections of the people following his discourses, and the free, unfettered access of people, and of scribes, of old men and youths, of

* Knowledge of Sadducees, Matt. xxii. 29 ff. Besides there were of course isolated Sadducees in Galilee. Herzfeld, 3, 386.

women and of children, as they crowd round the new Rabbi of Israel. Much the same must it have been in the youth of Jesus: for him then there will have been no lack of religious interchange of thought; and those very Scribes, who in the synagogues, in the market-places, and houses of entertainment made such a principle of publicity, will not have kept themselves back from his society, his searching of the Scriptures, his eager questioning; nor the people, in whose memory the religious ferments, conflicts and sufferings of Galilee under Herodians and Romans were fresh, have concealed from him their burning thirst for divine vengeance, for the Kingdom of God to burst upon their enemies.*

These meetings at the Synagogue and in daily life, as well as many a festal pilgrimage, such as the Galilæans loved, and the accurate acquaintance of Jesus with the system of sacrifice at Jerusalem presupposes, are in point of fact the only demonstrable, indeed the only historical, higher school of education for Jesus in the ordinary sense of these words. Other sons of Israel made longer journeys, even though they may not exactly have gone with the Princes of the House of Herod to Rome, the High School of the World. Josephus from his fifteenth or sixteenth year made a tour of observation among the sects of his people: he sojourned with the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes, and spent the longest time, well nigh three years, with the strange Bânus, the Hermit of the Desert: decided finally, in the nineteenth year of his life (56 A.D.) to become a Pharisee, and in his twenty-sixth year to finish by seeing Rome also.† Others (the majority) kept to one school: they went into the House of Instruction (Beth Midrash) belonging to some celebrated Scribe of Jerusalem. Strangers too came thither, as *e.g.* the five youthful sons of King Izates of Adia-

* Matt. xiii. 54 ff. Luke iv. 22. Matt. ix. 33. xi. 16 ff. xvi. 13-14. Mark i. 27; and see last page. Matt. viii. 2. 5. 19 ff. ix. 3, 14, 18, 27. xix. 3. 13. 16; and see Luke xi. 15, 27, 37, xii. 13, 31. xiv. 15. Cf. 158 (Synag.), Vol. I. p. 252, 256, p. 164, Note (Gal. and Judas G.)

† Jos. Vit. 2-3.

bene, who were to acquire in Jerusalem the sacred language and learning; or the young Saul of Cilicia, afterwards the Apostle, in quest of the renowned Gamaliel. Even poor people—what with the simplicity of Eastern life, content with figs and nuts, and what with the public provision for penurious scholars—and the moderate amount of the entrance fee—found it possible to attend these lessons, as seen in the importunity of Hillel the poor Babylonian youth, who had come to hear Shemaia and Abtalion, so touchingly portrayed in the tradition already cited. Far easier still must it have been to obtain access to the Essenes, those despisers of gold and goods.* In the case of Jesus we are forbidden by distinct evidence to entertain the thought of his having attended any such school, most of all one kept by the Scribes of Jerusalem, even though the Rabbis would explain how he learned even to work miracles, by the House of Instruction belonging to Josua Ben Perachia. His native town asks in amaze: Whence hath he this wisdom, this power? and no one answers: He hath been here or there, among the wise men of Jerusalem, or the Essenian wondermen.† The opinion of Paulus, that Jesus must notwithstanding, simply because he was called Rabbi among the people, have passed through the school of one sect or another, is quite untenable.‡ To pursue further the grounds of his keeping aloof from the schools, were lost labour. One can only say, that at first the parents of Jesus from poverty, or Galilæan prejudice, never thought of such journeys for their son; and that afterwards, Jesus, whose will could have burst every fetter, did not care about them.

* Cf. on Izates. Ant. 20, 3, 4, on Hillel, Vol. I. p. 342. The frugal meal (captive priest in Rome), Jos. Vit. 3. The provision from the tithe for poor scholars, Herzfeld, 3, 266. Grätz, 3, 124. Beside the customary manual employment must be borne in mind, p. 196. Essenes, Vol. I. p. 366, ff. 374.

† Matt. xiii. 54. John vii. 15. The Rabbis, Vol. I. p. 27, f. Hist. Jesch. ed. Huldr. p. 14, knows of tanti progressus in the Beth Midrash of Josua B. Per., ut addisceret etiam mysteriosum illud opus currus (Ezek. i. 15 ff.) atque arcanum nominis immensi. Thus he became (not first in Egypt) a wonder-worker.

‡ L. J. I. 122 f. On Jesus' Rabbinism, see Vol. III.

In the region of fable, accordingly, do all older and newer opinions range themselves, to the effect that Jesus had here or there the presumed necessary advantage of a higher course of education, such as his age supplied. An old Jewish expedient for explaining the miracles of Jesus was, as the Rabbis and Celsus showed us, Egypt, which the Gospels themselves, though without that intention certainly, brought to men's remembrance. Perhaps it is in the same connexion that the heathens of Justin's day are disposed to recognize in Jesus the master of magic arts.* How excellently did this Egyptian foundation serve the turn of even Celsus' sublimer conception of Christianity as a copy of Greek philosophy, which is employed by K. Fr. Bahrdt in his letters on the Bible in Popular Language, and by Gfrörer more particularly, to prove that Jesus was initiated in the Philosophy of the Alexandrine Jews. But still more in later times has the belief in a Rabbinical, Pharisaic, or Sadducean, most of all in a school of the Essene order in Egypt, or even in Judæa, seemed to commend itself. This latter view, which is so well able to explain the teachings and the miracles of Jesus, has been vigorously recommended since the seventeenth century by Englishmen, Frenchmen (Montfaucon, Voltaire), Germans, especially Staüdlin, and Paulus, not without the opposition of such men as Bengel, Ammon, and Schleiermacher; and once more repeated quite lately by Hilgenfeld; the most graphic and highly coloured picture of the Essenism of Jesus, which former times were only restrained by timidity from describing, has indeed been given by Venturini.

Through the care of Joseph of Arimathæa, the natural father, Jesus is taken in charge, already during the flight into Egypt, by the Essenes of the wilderness of Judæa, and afterwards by the Egyptian Therapeutæ in Heliopolis: on his return he promised, even as a boy, the aged Superior in the Desert,

* Orig. c. Cels. 1, 28. Just. Apol. I., 30. Cf. Vol. I. p. 27, 37 f.

that he will deliver the people, and become the Messiah. On his visit to the Temple in his twelfth year, he concludes an alliance of friendship with Joseph of Arimathæa, soon afterwards accepts, in company with John the Baptist, an invitation proffered by an Essene, who suddenly appears in the garb of Elias, to join his order, which he enters with his parents' approval, frequents subsequently from Nazara the meetings of the holy men, and resolves, by appropriating what was best in Essæism, while rejecting their formalities and renunciation of the world; but with the support, however, of their most eminent men—John the Baptist, and Joseph the Councillor at their head—to be a Saviour of his people.*

Here then the hypothesis has been turned into calmly ascertained history, let us rather say, romance. But all these hypotheses are loaded with extravagance, for they rest in general on no firmer basis than that of very faint likenesses, and overlook meanwhile, not only the definite statement concerning One who became great without schools, but, just as much, the great dissimilarities even in the midst of likeness. These dissimilarities would have to be explained, we presume, by a succession of schools as in the case of Josephus, only indeed thus bringing out more glaringly the contrast between the hypothesis and the historical account, or on the other hand by the great independence of the scholar in face of his Rabbis, an independence which, indeed, as the loftiest minds of Judaism, and even Paul himself show, would not so easily have arisen beneath the pressure of the scholastic mind, at any rate among Pharisees and Essenes; rather, if at all, among Sadducees. Thus historical statement unites with psychological probability to point rather to the conclusion: Jesus did without the schools, and well for him that it was so; in the circles of the synagogue the views of the schools must mainly have reached him, but without the constraint and the curse of a

* Natürl. Gesch. des grossen Proph. von Nazareth, 1, 105 ff. Besides, cf. Winer, Jesus, Bildungsmittel.

cringingly credulous and one-sided pupilage, rather in free suit, in all their manifold variety, so that he could prove, compare, choose, and combine. Pretty much on this wise many modern writers have conceived of Jesus' relation to the schools, especially Ammon, Schleiermacher, Hase, Schenkel, Weizsäcker, a view equally removed from the school theories, and from the dogmatic prejudice in favour of a pure independence and indifference on the part of Jesus towards the national culture, a phantom which Delitzsch and Hofmann cherish to this day.*

It is still possible to some extent to estimate how much, and how little, Jesus drew from these schools; that is, what he simply learnt, not forthwith made his own. Here what is most certain is, that he had a very accurate acquaintance both with the practice and theory of the Scribes and Pharisees, down to the point of somewhat finely distinguishing between special deliverances of theirs, and between celebrated individual teachers; and accordingly his subsequent antagonism was almost wholly levelled against this class. In disputing their astute and subtle, yet after all, spiritually void and morally bald expositions and distinctions, he follows them as an adept into the least minutiae, leaving them however not only the merit of having roused his fruitful contradiction, but also, as will be seen hereafter, of having furnished him with many lessons and even methods of teaching.† Of his connexion with the Essenes there is probably no trace to be found, and the entire New Testament never so much as once mentions this name. Vainly too should we appeal to the fact that his brother James, still more than Matthew the Apostle, is to some extent pictured as an Essene

* Cf. *Gesch. Christus*, 3rd Ed., p. 14 ff. Cf. Delitzsch, *Jesus and Hillel*, p. 24. Hofmann, *Erl. Z.* 1865, 1.

† *Gesch. Chr.* 3rd Ed. p. 17 ff. Already *Matt. v. 21 ff.* (cf. *Ch. xv. xxiii.*) proves that he had the several great Scribes in his eye, even though he put them together without name. The Jews generally specified both teachers and doctrines, Jesus in his discourse the doctrines only. *xxii. 17 ff.* shows that he knew the theory of Judas Gal.

by the pen of the second century ; or indeed, that the son of Zebedee, the favourite disciple, betrays Essenic colouring in the Book of Revelation ; for not only have we to ask whether the picture in question is historical, and whether the son of Zebedee really wrote the Apocalypse ; but nothing is more historically certain than that Jesus himself was anything but such an Essene.* Nevertheless we cannot but assume beforehand, that even this phase of piety among his people, admired, as indeed it was, for its singularity as the only "piety of the masses," among whom he was afterwards to work, would not escape the eye of Jesus. Yes, on nearer inspection, we may think that here and there he pointed at them, not indeed exactly as the Righteous, the Merciful, the Peacemakers of whom he speaks, but possibly as the "physicians," the "eunuchs" for the kingdom of heaven's sake, or as the hidden ones who set their light under a bushel.† Still more evident through all differences are the resemblances in principles great and small.‡ Many merely superficial points of contact, which may be quite otherwise explained, as the baptismal rite and the Supper must be simply set aside ; many deeper likenesses may be explained with Ammon as instances of congeniality rather than dependence, or as examples of a common allegiance to the spirit of the Old Testament. But far-reaching resemblances occurring at one time and at one place speak after all for a connexion of some kind or other, and Jesus is so steeped in the primitive, remote, and at the time forgotten spirit of prophecy, that it is not only allowable but necessary (as we shall afterwards see more in detail), to seek for the historical link, where it is offered by the age in question, in the prophetic loving school of the Essenes. If we acknowledge this connexion we have at the same time woven in a connecting thread

* Cf. the picture of James in Hegesippus, Eus. H. E. 2, 23 (however no oil, no bath). Matt. Vol. I. p. 94, Note: John, p. 370.

† Matt. v. 9, *εἰρηνοποιοί*. Cf. Jos. B. J. 2, 8, 6. *εἰρήνης ὑπουργοί*. 5, 7, *ἐλεήμονες*. Cf. 2, 8, 6 : *ἐπικουρία καὶ ἔλεος*. Righteous men, Matt. xviii. 12. Physicians, Luke iv. 23. Eunuchs, xix. 12. Light. 5, 14 f.

with the Judæism of Alexandria, which as we saw long ago, in the person of Philo, is closely enough allied to Essæism. This indirect connexion is opened up to us in another way, even by the Scribes of Jerusalem, who with all their traditional belief, yet still, as we see from Gamaliel's pupil Paul, enriched themselves with sundry important Alexandrine views.*

All the more then are we in a position quietly to put away the assumption of any direct relation to Alexandrinism from the life of Jesus; as of such, after all, every outer and inner trace is wanting; unless we venture to refer the representations of doctrine given in the fourth Gospel straightway to the mouth of Jesus. But the last and highest school in which Jesus learnt, we have still not mentioned yet. It was the Book of God, to which at last he betook himself entirely away from all the Teachers of Israel, the Book of God without him, the Book of Scripture, the Book of Nature, and the Book of Life, and the Book of God within him, the voice of his spirit and his conscience. But since it is impossible here to separate between what these books offered him and what he read in them, and found and got; nay, much more, just because he was the one man among the thousands in Israel to search, to read, and to understand these writings, therefore we can only speak of this school by speaking of him, of the singularity and free formation of the spiritual life, which the creative Godhead was about to found in him.

SECOND SECTION. THE PERSONALITY.

He who overlooking the individual would pretend to gauge the life of man by a mathematical standard alone, as though each were simply bound and broken in by the great laws of physics and of morals; above all, he who, just in *this* life of all others, believes he must make it a point of honour to scatter the halo and

* Peculiarities in which Jesus comes especially close to Philo are *e.g.* the belief in God's kindness to man, in man's dignity, the lightness of the Law, God's condescension in the Law, &c. (Matt. xix. 8.) cf. Vol. I. p. 276-291.

the haze which broods over this single personality, by the sober exposition of historical necessity, will find an easy method of making it all plain, how the historical motives at work to produce this life, the distance from the rites and schools of Jerusalem, this synagogal life less cumbered with ordinances and more spiritual as it was, this Galilæan naturality, freedom, toleration, which shrunk not from publicans and heathen, banquets and even images of Emperors,—together with the revolting impression of Pharisaic cant, finally, the contact which took place as a matter of course with the ethical affinities of popular Essæism, could not fail to have brought to maturity the moral Reformer of Israel. Yet in truth, if at the same time we consider the hallowed authority of the Scribes, the obvious veneration in which they were held even in Galilee, the enthusiasm of the entire youth of Israel for these saviours of their country, we shall be obliged to say, it is at the least just as possible that Jesus should have become a teacher of old traditions as the Man of a New Religion, so that the decision of the issue lay after all solely in his Personality. He became the New Man, because he was the Person that he was: yes, however much the freer elements of his home might favour this tendency, it was only through his personality that in the first place he mastered Pharisæism, and then transcended the modest rôle of an Essene or an enlightened Teacher of Virtue, and took up the position of a new leader of Religion raised high above the whole contemporary level.

But if we fall back upon the Person, it were ill advised to attempt an artificially exact analysis of disposition, temperament, and tendencies, inasmuch as without a greater wealth of historical data, without a complete insight into this mysterious work-chamber of the human spirit, and beset as we are with all kinds of prejudices now to exaggerate, and now unduly to diminish, we run the risk of clumsily bringing in upon the one hand the most lifeless abstractions and the most empty extravagances, and on the other the vexatious narrowness of our one-sided distor-

tions, into a picture which best speaks for itself, as in the page of history it breathes and moves.* Yet still we must make sure of the most easily seized and fundamental features, even if we cherish the most modest estimate of the task which history sets herself, of explaining the growth of spiritual facts; and our superstructure will be all the more unimpeachable if we lay down for our foundation as something stable and constant those special spiritual characteristics which the man notoriously exhibits or presupposes, and the very character of his people and tribe indicates whether by way of positive or negative suggestion.† Such a palpable peculiarity has already dawned upon us, while we were speaking not so much of him, as of the school in which he was brought up: the many elements of the culture of the time could not have found entrance into him, had it not been that his whole nature opened itself to them with that delight in gathering and hearing which belongs to the highest receptivity. The genuinely human essence of his nature, which brought with it no sort of prerogative of Divine omniscience to earth, appears nowhere more plainly than in this entire openness of soul for all shapes the world can show, his feeling for Nature, and for man, his social instinct, ready to take and give, all tokens of a thirsting spirit, which be it what it may in itself, is beholden and bounden according to God's ordinance, to feel around it in the wide range of creation, drawing thence its life, collecting itself, bethinking itself, and as an atom of spiritual being by friction with the whole, with

* Hase, *Leben J.* p. 77: "Every general characterization of Jesus is in danger of sinking down into a personified system of morals and psychology consisting of a catalogue of all possible virtues and capabilities." But to this sort of characterization he so far gives in his own adhesion, that he thinks it essential to the ideal of humanity (which he finds in Jesus) like God to have no sharply defined character, but rather the fair equilibrium of every energy. I myself have assumed in Jesus (*Gesch. Christus*) a threefold strongly marked endowment of temperament, sanguine, melancholic, and choleric. To these three bases, each strongly developed, we shall always come back again. I do not expressly set them forth above, in order to avoid general designations and silly objections (as that only the phlegmatic temperament is wanting).

† Cf. the Characterization in *Gesch. Christus*, 3rd Ed. 24 ff. 69 ff.

the spirit of God which rests on Nature and mankind, to waken and grow to maturity. Even as a man he continued so to gather in information concerning the history of his day and the talk of his people by means of eye and ear-witnesses, and loved himself to lie in wait (in a noble sense) for glimpses of the vain follies of men, and almost more, of their natural goodness of heart, their alms-deeds, their yearning for salvation, and on a wider scale the casting vote of faith, and the rent which it could open, through all the strata of the population. But the man betrays far more of what his eye and ear had gleaned in the age of boyhood and of youth : who could even think of doubting the forwardness of these tendencies, or what man would be likely to become such a friend of Nature as he was, only in the days of his riper age ? In that domain his observations were full of deep thought and fine discernment ; from the splendid white fragrant lily of the field as he depicts it in his Sermon on the Mount, the hen with passionate maternal love, clucking to gather its young beneath the shelter of its wide-spread wings, the birds of the air drawing for their sustenance on the world's great store, free from consuming care, the lambs blithely following their shepherd, yet going astray and roaming in the wild,—to the fox, that in the thicket builds his haunt and home, still more by far mankind, the games of the young in the market place, the wedding processions of the grown, the castles of princes, and the silken court costumes of the magnates of Tiberias, as well as the field employ of the sower and the wine-dresser, the sweat of the labourers, the sighs of prisoners in chains. Nor did he stop on the surface ; in the light of their possessions, their joys and griefs, of their speeches and their deeds, he interpreted mankind, and noted with the self-same sharpness of discrimination the goodness of heart which comes out in the circle of human society, and the race and chase of greed, of ambition, of lust and selfishness, of stormy wrath and humour-some vexation. And what was at once greatest and most delicate about these observations was always this, that at the deep

underground of all the corruptions which he saw prevailing, he ever again discovered a pearl of human dignity, a good self within the bad one, capable in one case of giving active proof of noble sentiment, in another of the uneasy conscience and the penitential tear.* This man within the man he doubtless had early enough discovered in publicans and sinners, and even in heathendom : yes, the greatest width and depth of the view with which he scanned the world, betrays itself just in this very fact that he looked on publicans and heathen, and that he looked them through. There lies a magic spell in this view Jesus takes of the world : simply as a pure intellectual passion it has the grasp of a strong fascination, because it shows us in defiance of our customary conception, this kindred, nay, mightily superior, busy wrestling and prevailing penetration of a spirit of humanity taking shape upon the field of human culture : but it is no merely intellectual passion, all this seeking is gilded besides by the breathing of warmest affection ; loving and rich in devotion with his whole heart and soul did he gaze on the world of his God, and even in passing from Nature, where he could rest with such pure sympathy to this " evil " world of men, he always came back at last athwart all the censure and irony which it called forth in him, to a fellowship of feeling and a high esteem for the dignity of human worth.† This livingness, and readiness of room within for impressions from the outer world, was a genuine Galilæan dowry in his spiritual equipment, and an invaluable means of furthering his future.

Here too, without aid of Pharisaic schools, his understanding unfolded to the rare acumen of comprehension and of judgment, as well as to the unequalled facility he possessed in picturing with sensuous perspicacity supersensuous truth, here too, his will

* Cf. Matt. vi. 23 : τὸ φῶς ἐν σοί. 26 : οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν ; xii. 12 : πόσω οὖν διαφέρει ἄνθρωπος προβάτου. Love of observation, Matt. ix. 4. xii. 25. Luke xiv. 7. xxi. 1.

† Matt. vii. 9-11. xii. 35. Cf. Son, daughter of Abraham even in the case of the wretched and sinful. Luke xiii. 16. xix. 9.

acquired its never faltering set towards the world and the race: here was developed instead of an empty idealism trampling the world to pieces, that fulness of experience, which placed at the disposal of the organ of a missionary leadership, all the resources, including all the evils of the age; and thus both the age itself and the future which was to follow. But here in the completeness of its contrasts is a quite uncommon nature. Side by side with the entire devotion of a gaze that is fixed upon the world stands the world-weaned retirement of a hermit. As, in the exercise of his calling, he subsequently lived; fleeing ever and again from the turmoil of the towns, the importunate quest and judgment of men, sometimes even from his disciples, often suddenly with haste and secrecy—to the stillness of the chamber, the quiet play of ripples on the lake, the lone and lofty mountains, the wilds, where none but the beasts of the field or the wanderers of a flock were there to greet him;—thus doubtless he had always lived. Every rightly constituted man has his line of retreat, that in the face of the onset of impressions and of tasks brought on him by the outer world, he may be and continue himself, maintain by dint of rest and self-recollection his proper personality as the fixed point round which his world must range itself. To the feeling of a pious Israelite this resting of the Self is most of all the rest in God, in whose infinite embrace the spirit of the creature assures itself of its right to be, and so to be; thus even these retreats of Jesus for contemplation and for prayer seem easy to understand in the person of Jesus, from the conformity of human nature to law, and, if we will, from the happy balance between national and tribal character; a Galilæan in the freshness and mobility of his sense for Nature and her living forms, a Jew in his brooding earnest, and the depth and reality of his life in God. Only let us at the same time confess that humanity elsewhere can scarcely show this even balance of centrifugal with centripetal force, and though it betray the same in a few happy spirits, putting to shame the one-sidedness of the others, yet that these

are of lighter calibre, cases of a middle mean in the development of these fundamental tendencies, which go to make up the harmony of life; whereas here each contrast is full and abrupt, stretched to the very pitch of perfection attainable by an overgrown one-sidedness, and yet no one-sidedness after all, but in virtue of the goodness and gigantic range of this nature, and again of this will;—a unity, a harmony that had no flaw. That here there were given qualities which have not elsewhere their like, is shown again by an accurate examination of this world-flying, anchorite Individuality itself. Here we are made aware in him of an augury at once of the profoundest spiritual depth, as well as of the mightiest will, an unending restless striving to get beyond the boundaries of the natural, beyond the limits of human nature, a renunciation of the whole world, a feeling of the nothingness even of riches that should compass the world, and of the utter helplessness of all human existence, which lives but from the alms and crumbs of the Eternal: but here too again in place of the leap of self-annihilation, the plunge of man's nothingness in God's Eternity, a profound repose of the creature in itself, an internal contemplation of inward riches along with outward neediness, a joyful recognition of the bright light, the everlasting worth of a human soul, a self-confirmation in the right of endless existence, a belief in personal elevation, and the dignity of mankind at large, in such strength of conviction as had never been before, and became henceforth the motive power of all future humanity's life.* But there is no destructive clashing of these inner contrasts with each other, only the sublimest equilibrium of the same in the inkling sense of a manhood akin to God, of the bending of God to his creature as with a human love, and of the Godlike destiny of this humanity. From this fundamental feeling arose the religion of Jesus, his own religion, and his religion for all men, in the form of an heroic will built upon a God of gracious loving-kindness, determined to meet

* Above, p. 170.

half way from below the God that approaches from above, and so to overcome the chasm between Godhead and Manhood yes, the inward tension between longing and possession, out-reaching and self-repose, and that upon the ground of an unsacrificed, nay, of an infinitely exalted human Personality, by dint of the inward transfiguration of man's nature into the glory of God's likeness, the temple of his indwelling.

Hence two great facts throughout the religious life of Jesus. On the one hand this deep, restful, blissful feeling of the love of God in the heart of a human nature dowered by God himself with privilege and nobility, sounding through all changeful moments of stillness and of toil, of life in prayer and life amidst the world, yes even in its storm and stress. On the other hand this not-to-be-restrained endeavour on the part of man to penetrate inwards and strive upwards, to conquer God for himself with the full energy of a holy will, which is resolved to make Godlike the whole actual living man, that is, the inmost pulses of the heart and spirit's life ; to bring them to full perfection and divine entirety of knowledge, of goodness, of life ; and of life in God. A Religion, a Self, a World of quite another kind from heretofore ! No pride of human exaltation, yet no cowering dread, no self-assurance of blunted sensibility, and yet no tremblingly busy haste, no loose relations of compromise bought with a few external performances, and yet no slaughtering self-murder of the man in ascetic mortification of the body, or ecstatic frenzy, and fanatic flights of the spirit. The religion of the loftiest idealism, in faith and will : and yet again so entirely measured, rational, and sober ; because resting on actual experienced facts, and built on earnest deeds of highest, fullest, and truly human, free, reasonable performance : by which in very truth and not merely with the half-heartedness of Philonic theories, the dark boundary line of millenniums between Deity and Humanity sinks into the abyss. This personal Religion of Jesus were surely ill-explained, if interpreted in the main as the resultant of mere

external motives, the acquisition of Jewish laws, the criticism of former Religions; or, failing all else, from the later assumption of Messiahship;—instead of, first and foremost, from the inmost and original, personal feeling of his life, from the natural bent of his spiritual being. Doubtless those motives were mighty enough in the spiritual development of Jesus, and yet in their operation wholly conditioned by inner religious experience, without whose potency Jesus could neither have grasped the higher prophetic Religion of the feeling-fraught heart and will, nor even the thought of a Messiahship allied to God. Out of nothing—why nothing can be made: and highest impassioned and deed-fraught steps of knowledge have their root not in logic and syllogisms, to which the world had long been able to raise itself, without making anything of them, without doing anything with them; but only in the sanguine soul of being and of life. Thus the Religion of Jesus reaches back mysteriously to his Person. We must not exaggerate, and think to lend already to the youth, of Jesus, the perfect consciousness of a child of God, which first in full strength and clearness arose in the Man as he fulfilled his Mission: but thus much will be true; in this personal life there must from the very first have been a sense of human dignity, a feeling of divine love, and a striving for perfection in God, mighty and pure, without the bitter drops of common human estrangement, impurity, unworthiness; a perfection such as scarcely elsewhere in the organization of mankind has in laborious disfigured fragments been formed before or since. Only from this fundamental fact, which with Paul we would call the higher perfection of a divinely human Creation of the great God in the fulness of the hastening, waiting ages of the world—are we able to understand the Religion, and the Man himself that followed: the pure, the sinless, the Son of God; yes, even the lad of twelve, who feels himself chained as by a higher power, to his Father's house. Out of this fundamental fact rises his holy youth. We must think of it as like the youth of others,

and yet again as unlike. Here, too, no simple persistency of the original equipment, no perpetuated childhood, rather a breaking away from childhood, a passing of immediate feeling into knowledge clear as day, of the dark and mighty impulse into self-conscious will, and into deed to which the will gave birth. But this mysterious transition from nature's condition to free personality, through which every human life has to pass, must be thought of otherwise in his case, than in that of others; that is to say, as a breaking away indeed, from childhood, but not as a breaking with childhood, or as a straying from better beginnings, combined with a painful return; but as a higher repetition of childhood in the sphere of freedom, as the step-by-step affirmation and transfiguration of the original purely good condition of his life by dint of a will bent back with willing independence to his original true being.*

That to this will there were not wanting moral struggles, lies in the essence of free self-development, as well as in the tempestuous force of his wrestling impulse after God in face of the rightful demands of his human nature at the same time; this, too, is guaranteed by the subsequent energy of his will towards himself, and towards his disciples, most of all by the stupendous inner crises of this life which, even after the firm resolution of his youth, with every intensification of the inward and outward earnestness of the life involved in his calling, ever broke forth anew.† Here we may leave the question entirely open, whether these inward struggles between good and evil, which left their embodied impression in the extraordinarily exact acquaintance possessed by Jesus of the virtues and vices of the human heart, are simply and solely owing to the freedom of choice exerted by his will in its unfettered liberty, confronted by the rich and everywhere heroic tendencies of his nature, and the requirements of his

* *Gesch. Christus*, 3rd Ed. p. 109 ff.

† The choleric endowment of his nature shows itself in his ministry as the ζῆλος θεοῦ towards himself and others. Cf. *Matt.* v. 29. vi. 24. vii. 13. xvi. 23. xxi. 12. xxvi. 40 ff.

calling, or whether, as with us, to the operation of a natural provocative to sin, to be thought of in his case, of course, only as an absolute minimum, which he, at all events descended from sinful parents, might have inherited; but as to the question, whether he ever yielded to this drawing of his will or of nature, so much as for a moment, not to say habitually in the days of his youth, on this head we cannot remain in doubt.* Is he, as we shall see hereafter, in the fulness of his life, the sinless in the present, and painless as regards the past? then both these facts alike forbid the assumption of any wrong step in youth, and it avails not to appeal to the prevailing fact of our sinful life, which never was his model, and was quite another from the first, namely, never quite an innocent one, but from the birth unhappily distraught and torn between innocence and guilty tendency; or, to crown all, with Hegelian Logic to extort the acknowledgment of the sheer necessity of an inner estrangement of every human life to the point of a breach with the good, as the conditional preliminary of all reconciliation with the same. Thus, then, we think of the youth of Jesus as the preserver of his primitive higher tendency without loss or waste; as shaping the instinctive dim ground of nature to the clearness of purity in will, and loftiness in knowledge: as the trainer of his godlike virtue, not without struggle, but without defeat, with that sure and steady progress, which could crown the years of his manhood with the consciousness of a goal attained, that union with God no longer the mere heirloom of his native lot, with which he was dowered beforehand, but an actual realized union with God; yet still a consciousness that never lost, notwithstanding

* Beyschlag, *Christol. New Testament* 1866 p. 57 has explained the accurate knowledge of sin as infinite love sounding the depths of the world's corruption, and objected to me that in case of an innate capacity for sin, a new birth however slight and subtle would be needed. This I have never maintained, and could only on the supposition that the innate "fuel" ever became in Jesus' case a liberating act of will, which however I deny, as it is *not* merely actual sin that I deny. The dispute as to the possibility of an extraordinary knowledge of evil arising is a fruitless one, since the actual temptations of Jesus show that the incitement to sin in the realm of personal experience had at any rate an existence.

the grandeur of his course, the sense of a deep humility in the face of God and Man.*

This was the world of Jesus without, within. But both of these are not only pregnant and mighty worlds, moving side by side, and allowing each the other free independent play: the completion of this majesty of being lies in the unity that masters all duality, in the self-enrichment of one world from the other; a unity desired by this nature, and which the iron will that let nothing escape it of its own, not only attempted but carried out. Indeed, it is plain enough how the outer view of the world which Jesus took deepened in proportion as it was accompanied by the self-regarding gaze of his inner world; guided by the external phenomenon of sin in the world, he could not so penetratingly, so thoroughly have laid the probing finger of a keen observer on the inward vital processes going on within polluted and uneasy human hearts, unless before, and then, the still self-scrutiny of his own heart had been perfected, and trained him to be the psychologist he was, piercing, striking, cutting to the very marrow. So on the other hand his inner man became to him clear and sure of interpretation, so that indeed all overdrawn vagaries were displaced as by the bright, sharp, sober light of day, by virtue of a thousand-fold experience which in the name of God came from without to the help of his musing self-study to waken, to clear up, and to intensify the same. And from this most important side he demands especially our further and more particular attention: from the side of his inner growth under the play of those outer influences which streamed in upon him, and which we have long designated as such. It is a great error to think of him as one independent of the course of the world, and the lessons of history, but it is a still greater error to give up the greatest in the history of the world, the Person of the new world-creation, a prey to mere phases of de-

* Matt. xi. 27-30. Seldom as Jesus expressed himself concerning his inner world, yet his meekness and lowliness, Matt. xi. 29, he did not keep back from men, when he would lure them from timidity to confidence.

pendence. The truth is, he was independent amid all phases of dependence, because the world could only give him what he would freely take, that which his own peculiar, mighty, hidden, inmost nature, recognized and welcomed as akin to itself, as the full expression of, or the faint allusion to itself, and thus seized as serviceable means for its own self-knowledge and self-explanation, as available raw material for self-culture and self-formation. In this dialogue between the within and the without, Nature herself and the daily life of the world spoke a louder language to his spiritual ear than men have ever heard. The glory of God which he beheld in his conscience he understood still more clearly when he gazed upwards to the throne of heaven, to the majesty of the sun ; and even so, when upon the footstool of the earth beneath the golden glances and greetings from on high he saw the flower growing, budding, blooming in more than Solomon's splendour, or the eye of man reflecting the sun of heaven, and lighting up a new world of body and of mind ; or when he found the parched and fainting earth with its thousand forms of life, preserved by streams of rain descending from the sky, and feeble man, unable to change the hue of a single hair, or to increase in stature by a single span, saved by the simple yes and no of the Creator beholding every need and every heart.* The earnest, the holiness, the righteousness of God, which daily compelled his soul to mighty vows and services of purity in heart and life, rewarding it too with inward satisfaction, he discovered with amaze again in the rest and unrest, in the blessedness and consternation which brooded over the spirits of men, and in the Divine judgments of him who weighed with even measure his deserts to each, the pious and the godless, the praying and the prayerless, the placable and the implacable.† But above all else grew clear and bright to him the love of God in hundred tokens throughout the lower creation, too, even as he was privileged to feel it within : here in

* Matt. v. 35. vi. 22, 26 ff. v. 45.

† Matt. xi. 29. vii. 1 ff. 7 ff. vi. 14. xviii. 35.

the fowls of the air and in the grass of the field, living all careless beneath God's fostering hand; here in mankind that in its helplessness could still keep up its head; here most of all in the wicked who enjoyed his sunshine and his rain; and where misgiving would threaten his belief, as he surveyed the need and evil in the world, there he laid hold of the weak shadows of created goodness, human fathers, who listened to their children's plea, the shepherds, who sought for that which was astray; in order to be assured that it was not possible that the Great and the Good One in the heavens should not have mercy on his own mankind.* It was the greatest discovery and conquest which the picture book of an earthly world has afforded the mind of man, that to the infinite augury of Jesus' heart, on whom the God of Goodness, yes, of fatherly love for humanity dawned, it responded with a loud Amen.

From the schools Jesus could only borrow piecemeal. Among the Pharisees he was struck by the religious ground-thought, the mighty idea of God, and the consciousness of unconditional obligation to deeds of piety and obedience to the law. With the Pharisees he afterwards proclaimed the God of Omnipotence, unbending rule and rigorous retribution: like the Pharisee he found the destiny of man in the service of God, the zeal for God and Scripture, holiness, righteousness in heart and act, and in love of our neighbour: like the Pharisee he took his out-look on a kingdom of God, in which God's gift and man's performance meet, in which virtue shall find its meed, and even earthly dissolution a resurrection of the good. In a mysterious world of spirits, angels and demons, guardian and tormenting spirits, he believed in common with the Pharisees and the whole of later post-exilic Jewry.* Many of his positions, many of his arguments are an immediate echo of Pharisaic

* Cf. Matt. vi. 26 ff. vii. 7-11 and the whole Sermon on the Mount, xviii. 12. Human need remediable or at least endurable through God, vi. 11. xiii. 34.

† Cf. The Pharisees, Vol. I. p. 324 ff. Gesch. Chr. p. 17 ff. The Pharisees' *εισαγγελία* cf. Matt. xi. 25. xiii. 11. xvi. 23. xxii. 21. xxvi. 54.

deliverances, and side by side with resemblances to the house of Hillel, there are others which recall Shammai.* But very much besides, almost the greater part, he cast away from him utterly and with aversion, all the more that the inner essence of his spirit doubtless rejected it at an early period, and that without any preliminary self-deception. To a slavish sense of God, which in its fear found no freedom and no love, he could give no place, and most of all that worship became an abomination to him, which wandered from the Word of God to tradition, from the temple precincts of the heart to hypocritical, theatrical ceremonies, such as he beheld a hundred times, and a hundred times condemned.† In many respects he saw in the Essenes more to satisfy him: here he found deeper and more earnest forms of worship; and that longing for retirement from the world to God, their natural feeling, their native kindliness and humility towards men, in whom they saw brethren, contained the beginnings, not only of that artless genuinely human religion, which lived in the heart of Jesus, but also of that lively inward union with God, to which by his inmost being he was drawn.‡ Thus then he had a nearer contact with them in their preference for a pure worship of the heart, in their general tone of sentiment, in their love for their brethren in presence of the pure and perfect God, whose were the heavens, the sunshine, angels and humankind; in a word—in the practice of a more than legal, a prophetic worship of God. Their piety, their inner purity, their conquest over lust and wrath, their truthful spirit that needs no oath, and looks on every word that goes beyond “yes” and “no” as one too many; their peaceable disposition, their compassion, their readiness to serve others, is both for them and him the true virtue, and

* Cf. in the first place *Gesch. Chr.* p. 17 ff. *Matt.* vii. 12 reminds one of a saying of Hillel's (cf. above, Vol. I. p. 331) xii. 1 ff. of a well known argument of Hillel's, Vol. I. p. 336. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 18, *Matt.* v. 32. xix. 9. xviii. 17 of Shammai's views. More particulars in the history of Jesus' teaching.

† Cf. *Matt.* vi. 1 ff. xv. 3.

‡ Cf. the *Characterization of the Essenes*, Vol. I. p. 363 ff. Also *Gesch. Christ.* p. 14 ff.

better than sacrifice and temple-service. Equally close is the connexion between them in the principle of world-renunciation, which the religion of the Pharisaic "friends of God," so little knew how to attain; for both the world "lieth in the wicked one," is sick, in need of "the physician," for it serves earthly treasure, gold and silver, house and chattels, avarice, selfishness. The good is without requirements, he limits his wishes to bare necessities, which God gives to all; he needs no possessions, he wanders without provisions, and without weapons, and that even when a far journey, or risk of life seems to make them permissible. If he is perfect, he gives his house and goods, and even what he has for the moment, away, he even refrains from marriage, which hinders him in his relations with the Most High, delighting in the children and young men, who fall to him from the world, in order to seek a share in his perfection. Much as here attracted, quite as much repelled him. In the galling literalism of Essene legality, and in the moody asceticism of distinctions between clean and unclean, which was itself inconsistent with their prophetic piety, he could not recognize either himself, or the pure world of his God, in which he could morally renounce and yet harmlessly enjoy, sit at the feast, and even receive anointing at the hands of devoted women. In their puerile misgivings, in their revelations of ecstasy and dream, in their methods of enchantment with plants, and stones, and names of angels, he could not lay hold of the God of love, the Covenant God, of whom his free soul was in quest. In their flight from men, from the unclean sinner, even from their nearest blood; from the people that belonged to God, and, as the great house of God, was awaiting the inheritance of His Kingdom, his belief in God found as little satisfaction as did his love for mankind, and his open heart that beat with patriotic throbbings. Thus it was that no communion could tell him, nor give him in full what he inwardly felt and sought; as he sought and as he took he was driven back, driven farther, driven again upon himself. To take

little, and to give much, that was the destiny, changeless as divine, that presided over his life.

Even the Schools opened out for him the way to his last and highest outward School, the Scripture, which modern belief, blind to the evidence and the ways of God in history, would fain make perforce the only School of Jesus, and scarcely even that.* The Schools showed him the Scriptures, and the Scriptures hand in hand with the special temper of his spirit, here confirmed and here rejected the teachings of the Schools. In his reverence for the Scriptures he was like the Scribes, and still more the Essenes, in so far as for them no tradition might override the Law, and no Law might override the Prophets.† Even words in the historical sacred books, and indeed such words, as were not immediately ascribed to God, are still God's words.‡ Although written by men they are written in the spirit of divine revelation.§ These words have an everlasting validity above all words of men, they are God's commands to humanity, and God's plans for humanity, which must be entirely fulfilled.|| "It is written!" "have ye not read?" in his argument in the midst of opponents, and apart from opponents: and even the conditions of the age are described in the prophets, not only because Jesus in his freedom sees across the chasms of time, but because they had actually seen the mighty deeds of the future.¶ Not a point may fail; on the contrary, the omnipotence of God stands to his word, and roots out the teachings of men, which would raise themselves against the Word of God.** Thus Jesus

* Delitsch, *Jesus u. Hillel*, 1866 p. 24: and how often have the Essenes been made to do service! Only Old Testament prophecy (for the Essenes and Jesus stand in mutual repulsion) is a point of contact for the doctrine of Jesus. Similarly Hofmann, *Erl. Zeitschrift* 1865 I. Uhlhorn Art. Essenes. We may shortly reply: how often has the Old Testament and the good God himself been made to do service off hand, in order to explain this life!

† Cf. Matt. xv. 3 ff. xxii. 29. xxvi. 54. xix. 4 f.

‡ xix. 4 f.

§ xxii. 43.

|| xxvi. 54.

¶ xii. 3, 7. xxi. 16. 42. xxii. 31. Foretelling by the Prophets xiii. 14. xv. 7.

** v. 17 ff. xv. 3 ff.

takes in hand believingly the entire Scriptures, Moses and the Prophets as he loves to call them, from the first book of Moses down to the Chronicles, dating from the Macedonian age, the book of Daniel from the age of the Syrians, the later moral saws of Sirach, which Judæism no longer reckoned among the tale of its holiest Scriptures. Yet while he doubtless used this Scripture for weightiest reference, he did not however exactly give it the name of divine authority.* Critical doubts he harboured none, neither as to the second portion of Isaiah or Zechariah, nor as to the book of Jonah or of Daniel, nor as to the Davidic origin of various Psalms.† With the Law of Moses he is accurately acquainted even in its outward ordinances, sacrifices and Temple usages, priestly rights, Sabbath, tithe, and marriage regulations, judicial procedure, oaths, and recompense. Yet still the temper of his mind involved distinctions on his part between great and small commands, and a preferential retention in his memory of the former, the ten Commandments, and the inculcations of love to God and our neighbour contained in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. Jesus' proclamation of the Law will form an important question as regards the teaching of Jesus. In the history of Israel he goes back to the account of Creation, to Abel, to Noah, to Abraham and to the Fathers, to Lot and Sodom, to the time of the giving of the Law, to David, to Solomon, to the Queen of Sheba, and comes down as far as a little known prophet under King Joash, Zacharia the son of

* Moses and the Prophets. Matt. v. 17. vii. 12. xi. 13. Gen. i. 27. ii. 24 in Matt. xix. 4 f. 2 Chron. xxiv. 20. in Matt. xxiii. 35. Of the Prophets we find quotations or allusions to Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Joel, Hosea, Micah, Zachariah, Malachi, 1) viii. 11. xi. 4 ff. xiii. 13 f. xv. 7 f. xix. 28. xx. 22. xxi. 13, 33, and elsewhere. 2) xxi. 13. 3) xxvi. 64. 4) xxiv. 29. 5) ix. 13. xii. 7. 6) x. 21. 35 f. 7) xxi. 2. xxvi. 31. 8) xi. 10. 14. Psalms; xxi. 16. 42, xxii. 43, -xxiii. 49. The later writings especially; Dan. Matt. xiii. 43. xxi. 44. xxiv. 15. 30. xxvi. 64. Sirach li. 29-33 in Matt. xi. 28 ff. Luke xiv. 28 reminds of 2 Macc. ii. 30 yet without being dependent on it.

† Isa. li. 17 in Matt. xx. 22. Isa. lvi. 7 in Matt. xxi. 13. Isa. lxi. 1 in Matt. xi. 5. Jonah Matt. xvi. 4 and elsewhere. Daniel, see above. Psalm cx. 1 in Matt. xxii. 43.

Joiada, everywhere extracting spiritual and moral truths, nowhere more antiquities, or trivial historical traditions.* To the Prophets he devoted himself with special preference. In later life he more frequently appealed to them than to Moses : sometimes in naming them he placed them before Moses.† One can see that he made use of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Micah, Jonah, Zechariah, Malachi ; Isaiah and Daniel, both of whom he introduced by name, most frequently.‡ In the prophets particularly did he find again the higher religion of love to God and Man, which he found to begin with in his own heart. The saying of Hosea, “mercy and not sacrifice,” became his favourite saying ; but instead of believing on that account in a deeper opposition to the Law which itself again was after all divine, the decalogue and every glorious word of the Law showed him that the Law and the Prophets mean the same, and that it is only in its condescension to the Jews that the Law sinks its requirements, it may be even to a carnal level.§ But how much besides attracted him in the Prophets ! the majestic fire of their speech, from which he afterwards drew not only this or that picture, but the corner-stones of whole parables, as well as their deep tones of anguish respecting the contradictions, unbelieving, sensual people ; but most of all their Messianic gaze into the future, the coming in of the Gentiles, the signs of the approaching Kingdom of God, of its Forerunner as well as of its Anointed.|| In the mysterious thousand-hued splendour of the picture of Messiah, was comprised for him all the height of humanity in the presence of God and his Creation, as Mosaism, prophetic of its future, had represented it from the first book of its sacred archives onwards ; and while the boy, the youth, was far from

* 2 Chron. xxiv. 20. 21. in Matt. xxiii. 35.

† Matt. v. 12. xiii. 17. Cf. xi. 13.

‡ See p. 183, first note.

§ Hosea vi. 6 in Matt. ix. 13. xii. 7. Again moral estimate of Law and Prophets. Matt. v. 17. xii. 22. 40. Condescension of the Law Matt. xix. 8.

|| Cf. the Parable xxi. 33 with Isa. v. 1 ff. Again the similes, cup of suffering, den of thieves, &c. Tones of grief cf. xiii. 14. xv. 7. x. 21. 35. Future cf. viii. 11. xi. 14, xvii. 12. Ch. x. Ch. xxiv.

daring with presumptuous hand to apply to himself that lofty portraiture of deified man, yet did he live in the still fruition of that fertilizing sunbeam of a belief, which was ready to disclose to every child of Israel its power to allure, to elevate, to bless ; and in his spirit lovingly drew upward to itself all the forecasting heights and depths of his being, as the shooting of a tender growth.* With the same interest Jesus immersed himself in the Psalms, and who finds it otherwise than conceivable that he should look up most attentively the Psalms of David, the songs that breathed the piety of the king beloved of God, the Father of the Future, the Pride of Israel ; his ancestral Lord, who reached forward from a hoary eld to meet the Salvation of the future, even his own Lord.†

In this learning from the Scripture is shown simultaneously the most religious subjection to the Word of God, as well as his freedom from slavery to the letter, such as might prevail among Scribes and Essenes. Neither without the other. An absolute superiority or even a position of equality in relation to the Word of God, such as is implied by Weizsäcker, Jesus never claimed either now or afterwards : rather does he bow before the Word of God as a standard to himself and to the world.‡ But he freely proves and freely chooses that which is akin to his Nature : that which is less akin he looks at by the light of the great truths, or even explains it to himself by the stages of divine revelation. To his freedom belongs the fact that he has no notion of piling up an argument by an anxious array of passages, but only takes up so to speak, as occasion offers, those texts in which the keynote of his own view of the world is sounded : and again in the fact that he brings together into one view, by his words and by his mode of regarding them, things that are wide apart, Moses and the Prophets, sayings concern-

* In the praise of man (Psalm viii.) he found that of the Messiah (Matt. xxi. 16.)

† Cf. Matt. xxii. 42 ff.

‡ In Matt. vii. 24 he is but the exponent of v. 17 f. xxiv. 35 refers specially to his prophecy. Cf. p. 182. Otherwise indeed the fourth Gospel.

ing the love of God and the love of Man, the Temple as a House of Prayer, and as a den of thieves; finally, that he draws far-reaching and weighty conclusions from Bible words; at one time acutely, as when from the permitted breach of the Sabbath by the priests he infers his own right with regard to the Sabbath; at another time profoundly, as when, from the self-presentation of God as the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, he gathers the assurance for himself of the eternal life of a humanity united to God.* These are instances of his later use of Scripture, but in this way doubtless will he have appropriated Scripture from the first. A peculiar manifestation of the freedom of his affinity to Scripture, is the belief of Jesus, notwithstanding his faith in the divine origin of the Scriptures, in a free co-operation of the human authors of Scripture, in which he differed from the wise men of his time. We are here involuntarily reminded of the parallel supplied upon a smaller scale by Luther with his grand free human conception of Scriptural Inspiration. Moses permitted it thus, David in the spirit named the Messiah his Lord; the Prophets longed to see the Day of the Lord, as did the Righteous as well as the Prophets, and doubtless David and the other Psalmists, who according to the view of Jesus, proclaimed in their songs not only divine truth, but equally their human piety, their genuinely human yearnings.† Of these human peculiarities of the sacred writers he could only think because his feelings and thoughts met with something kindred in theirs; and for this reason also he will have read the Prophets and the Psalms with that preference which he showed for them, because he found in them all the power and all the charm of the life of human souls.

Such then or thereabouts according to a conscientious, yet after all but a weak and wavering estimate, were the main

* Matt. xxii. 37 ff.—xxi. 12 (Isa. lvi. 7. Jer. vii. 11). Matt. xii. 5. xxii. 31 f.

† Matt. xix. 8. xv. 7. xxii. 43. xiii. 17.

features of the spiritual nature and youthful development of Jesus; a height sublime of religious, of mental, of moral capacities and self-culture. The greatest contrasts strongly stamped, here of the inward and the outward; here of the sentient soul on the one hand, and of the intelligence and will upon the other; here of the Godward impulse on the one side, and on the other the love of world and individuality, and in these definitive tendencies we should incline to say in opposition to Hase, a character sharply drawn, and yet again, we will say with Hase, an Ideal of Humanity; like God, the fair equivalence of every power.* Even in his moral character there was sharpness of contrast and harmony notwithstanding. We are fond of describing him as a manly, collected, serious, strong and strenuous character; and there is some truth in this; "a Zealot" one may call him with John if one will give him a short name.† But has not also the older description of his warmth of heart, and the gentle gladness for which Strauss praises him, most of all his own description of lowliness and meekness, an unmistakeable support in our sources of information?‡

And does not this twofold moral trait take its own place spontaneously, only new born and sharper ground by the action of his will, by the ethical claims which he makes upon himself and others, in the long observed duality of openness to the world and Godward impulse, which in his moral attitude could not fail to show itself as earnestness and cheerfulness at once, as Jewish gravity and Galilæan gladness, as iron deed combined with gentle resignation, of which each side was at the same time its counterpart?§ The question indeed whether Jesus pos-

* Hase L. J. p. 77.

† Hase p. 78. Weizsäcker p. 437. Cf. only Matt. xxi. 12. John ii. 17.

‡ Strauss p. 208. Matt. xi. 29 and his actual power of attraction. To doubt the genuineness of this wonderful passage is rank treason. Cf. below the prosopographia in Epist. Lentuli.

§ Cf. Gesch. Christus 3rd Ed. p. 69. It is a correct observation in the Epist. Lentuli (cf. below): qui nunquam visus est ridere, flere autem sæpe. But obviously

sessed all possible perfections of human nature, whether he was the perfect ideal man, we have partly in a manner already answered, partly we must defer for consideration until we come to the completion of his manhood, partly however we must meet it with a final negative.

Doubtless there was in him such a plentitude of powers and of moral force that even in other domains besides that of religion he might have been as great as, or greater than, the greatest. We may speak of rhetorical, of poetic capacities, we may find it possible that Jesus should have become a philosopher, a natural philosopher, perhaps even a great statesman, or actually an artist. In any case, however, no man of war. But this is not the only thing in which it was after all with Jesus as with other men. Even with others many capacities remain hidden, because one predominates, because the strength of the individual is not adequate to the training of all the faculties, in fine because the surroundings and demands of the age require one career, forbid or hinder another. On all these grounds we are wont to say, the destination of such minds lay in this domain and not in another. So it was too with Jesus. The dictatorial sway in his spiritual being was wielded by Religion, and by religious action, and under the overshadowing of Religion every other endowment could only become a furthering means for the former, never an end in itself and a definitely presented object. His nation too imposed on him this and no other line of activity. And the whole age desired in him the Man of Religion. In so far he was no all-sided Ideal, and he could not have become so. In poetic flights he reached not to Isaiah, nor in earthly wisdom—to an Aristotle or Plato to begin with: nay not even to a Philo. The ideal man he was in religion and religion only, as we saw, and shall see again.*

this is founded more in the conception of the sources, than in the nature of Jesus.
Cf. Hase p. 78.

* Cf. Hase p. 77.

The vagaries of fancy in respect of the perfections of Jesus have extended to his bodily appearance. It is true the more ancient Church of the second century, in view of the Crucified one, breaking loose from heathenish deification of material things, and taking its stand on the Old Testament, not indeed on the charming portraiture of David, but on Isaiah's delineation of the suffering servant of God—thought rather of a Christ *without* form or beauty, than of an ideal of beauty—which Clement found only in his soul, in his beneficence; and characteristically enough the heathen Celsus saw accordingly in the ugliness of Jesus the refutation of his Divinity!* But at the same time the Christian Gnostics who stood nearer to heathendom, such as the Basilidians and Carpocratians, began already to make visible representations for themselves of the Lord in pictures, upon gems, metal plates and statues, which last they crowned with wreaths and adored in heathen fashion; and the mere fact of picturing him together with their regard for heathendom, still more their lower estimate of the figure on the Cross, and the placing of the Saviour side by side with Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle, brought about as a natural consequence an ideal representation after the pretended original by Pilate.†

In the third century this picture had made its way into the domestic chapel of the pagan Roman Emperor Alexander Severus side by side with the great Kings and Emperors, and the "holy souls," Abraham, Orpheus, Apollonius.‡ In the fourth century Eusebius, Bishop of the orthodox Church in

* Isa. lii. 14. liii. 2. David. 1 Sam. xvi. 12. Just. Dial. C. Tryph. 14. 36. 85. 88. (ἀειδὴς ἁδοξος, ἀτιμς). Clem. Strom. 2, 440. Pæd. 3, 1, 3: τὴν ὄψιν αἰσχροῦς. The beauty of his soul was his beneficence, that of his body his immortality! Tert. d. Carn. Chr. ix.: nec luminæ honestatis corpus fuit nedum cœlestis claritatis. adv. Jud. 14: ne aspectu quidem honestus Or. e. C. 6. 75 ff: τὸ σῶμα μικρὸν καὶ δυσεὶδὲς καὶ ἀγενὲς ἦν. The second Orig. grants. Cels. 6. 75. Just. appeals to Psalm xxiii. and Jer. liii. (C. 36. 85.)

† Ir. e. Hær. 1, 24, 5 (Basilid.) 1, 25, 6: formam Christi factam a Pilato (Carp.). Philosophum. 7, 32: καὶ εἰκόνας δὲ κατασκευάζουσι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, λέγοντες ὑπὸ Πιλάτου τῇ καιρῷ ἐκεῖνῳ γενέσθαι.))

‡ Lamprid. A. Sever. c. 29.

Palestine, saw many kinds of old paintings and images of Jesus and of his first Apostles, in which he was fain to recognise the gratitude of heathens for salvation expressed "according to genuine heathen custom." Particularly he and others were shown in Paneas on the springs of the Jordan, the house of the woman who had an issue of blood, with a votive tablet put up by her at the door, herself in a bronze image on a stone pediment, kneeling, with outstretched hands; opposite her, also moulded in bronze, Jesus standing upright, his ample cloak wrapt round him with dignity, and stretching out his hand to the woman. From the base there rose as far as the hem of his garment a living plant of strange description, the remedy for every sickness. In the genuineness of the picture, it is true, we can hardly, with Hase, believe: since even Eusebius himself betrays no great faith in it. Doubtless it was of heathen origin like the place itself, and there was all the less ground for referring it to Jesus in that the woman with the issue of blood had nothing to do with Paneas.*

However, as Jerome and Augustine show, such pictures were henceforth ever on the increase, and instead of the suffering servant of God, and instead of Psalm xxiii. Jerome himself preferred appealing to Psalm xlv. "Thou art the fairest among the children of men."† The dominant Alexandrine mode of thought with its proclamation of the glory of Christ favoured this sublime conception, although Eusebius just on that very ground had called it impossible to picture the Christ transfigured into Godlike glory, in a human form.‡ The Nestorians called the Patriarch Cyril of Alexandria neither more nor less than the author of image worship.§ Thus

* Eus. H. E. 7, 18. The picture is said by Sozom. H. E. 5, 20 f. Philostorg. H. E. 7, 3, to have been taken away by the Emp. Julian, acc. to Aster. Amas. ap. Phot. (Hofmann p. 293) by Maximin. Particulars along with literature of the subject in Hase § 32, also Winer, A. Jesus.

† Psalm xlv. 3. Jerome on Matt. ix. 9. Aug. de Trin. 8, 4.

‡ Eus. ad Constantiam in Act. Conc. Nic. II. a. VI. Cf. Kurz K. G. 3rd. Ed. I. 2, 294, 4.

§ Assemb. Bibl. Orient. III. 2, 401, Kurz. p. 296.

especially in the East, in spite of all the resistance on the part of the great teachers, who in these pictures of Jesus would see a revival of heathendom, and a bringing down of God to the level of a creature; yet through the demands of the populace with difficulty weaned from paganism, and the complaisance of Theology, images came more and more into use after the fifth and sixth centuries: images whose faithfulness to life were proved from the time of Evagrius (sixth century) by the theory of miraculous impressions which Jesus himself by means of his garment sent to King Abgarus of Edessa, or Veronica took with the drying veil upon the way to Golgotha, and Nicodemus from the body in the linen; or finally, by pretended primitive pictures by St. Luke, a master in the double art of speaking and painting.*

A series of such ideal descriptions of the appearance of Jesus has been handed down under the name of the last great Greek writer on dogma, John of Damascus in the eighth century, and by the last Greek historian Nicephorus in the fourteenth century; the best known is one by a pretended Publius Lentulus in a letter to the Roman senate, which however was not written until mediæval times; not before the twelfth century. We will not wholly disregard the delineation of Nicephorus and Lentulus, little as we shall find there laid down beyond the old artistic ideal, and indeed to be more exact, even in Lentulus that of Byzantium, to which Nicephorus more than Lentulus has added a few traits from the lowly suffering Son of God. He was very fair to behold, says Nicephorus. His stature was full seven spans. His hair was fair, and not very thick: slightly tending to curl, his eyebrows however were black and curved, his eyes bright and with a dash of yellow, the nose prominent, the beard yellow and not reaching far down. He wore the hair of his head long, for neither scissors nor the hand of man ever came upon his head, except only the hand of his mother when he

* Cf. Hase p. 79 f. Hofmann p. 291 ff. Kurz loc. cit. Winer A. Jesus.

was still a child. He stooped somewhat in his gait, walking not quite erect. His complexion was of the hue of wheat, his face not round but oval like that of his mother, and only slightly ruddy. Dignity and intelligence, gentleness and freedom from all passions are therein expressed. He was altogether the like of his blessed and immaculate mother. The picture of Lentulus rather paints his glory: he is a man of lofty stature, of much presence, and of venerable countenance: he who looks on him may love and fear him. His hair moreover is curled and crisp; very dark coloured, and of a brilliant sheen, falling from his shoulders in waves, parted in the middle of his head after the manner of the Nazarenes (Nazarites). His forehead is open and altogether clear; his face without a wrinkle or spot, of moderate redness and lovely to behold. Nose and mouth are blameless, the beard is strong and dark, of the colour of the hair, not long, but parted in twain: the eyes bluish grey and clear. In rebuke he is awful, in exhortation mild and amiable, cheerful without loss of dignity; he whom none ever saw laugh, but often weep. His carriage is straight and upright. His hands and arms are glorious to behold. In speech he is short and modest: the fairest of the children of men.* Such is the fundamental conception, which passed across the threshold of the middle ages and is seen preserved to the times of the Lutheran Church's dogmatic writers, among whom the younger Helmstädt, J. B. Carpzov in the year 1777 reopened the pages of these old descriptions with all the old interest and half the old belief. But even with men as late as Venturini, and in Renan's own Romance, the idea found favour of a fair Galilæan youth, in

* Gabler in *authentiam Ep. Lent.* progr. I. II. 1819, 1822. Also *Opp.* tom. 2, 636. (Ulm 1831). Also in *Fabric. Cod. ap. N. T.* 1, 301 ff. Winer loc. cit. Hofmann loc. cit. The portraiture of Nicephorus 1, 40 cf. 2, 7. 43. 6, 15. Delitzsch, *Jesus u. Hillel* p. 3. As regards the reddish hair one is reminded not only of the *comæ flavæ* prized by the Romans, but still more of the ancestor David, 1 Sam. xvi. 12. John Dam. *Ep. d. ven. imag.* (from the time of the raid on images since 730) *Opp. Ed. Mich. Lequient.* 631 cf. Hase p. 80.

whom along with the Marys even the wife of a procurator might take some interest.* Historically we know much less. Thus much doubtless at all events. That the pious homage paid by antiquity to the Saviour in the glorification of his flesh, while we curtail its details, is right upon the whole. To begin with we cannot easily think of the even balance and harmony of the spirit that rests in God, as united to bodily decrepitude or even a repellent physiognomy: we think of him as healthy, vigorous, of expressive countenance, not as Winer and even Hase supposed on insufficient grounds, without characteristic features; as if a spirit and a will like his must not needs create what was full of character: perhaps he was not exactly beautiful; but at any rate noble, with his whole heart in his features; of prepossessing presence.† So, more or less, he appears in his history. We find no passage to prove that his outward form had been the subject of eulogy like that of the youthful high priest Aristobulus under Herod the Great.‡ On the other hand it is plain that his was a manly, commanding, prophetic figure. The people, so much at the mercy of outward impressions, could not otherwise have greeted him, especially just after John, as a prophet, nay, as the Son of David, and the reproach of his foes would else have attacked him even on the side of bodily defects. Besides we have the fact lying before us, that his appearance on the scene, his word, his voice, his eye, seized and shook the hearer and beholder; and that men, women, children, sick and poor, felt happy at his feet and in his presence. That the full freshness, quick vitality, and penetrating sharpness of all the senses were his, is shown by the rich view of the world which his spirit was enabled to

* Carpzov de oris et corp. J. Chr. forma Pseudo-Lentuli etc. prosopographiæ 1777. Venturini 1, 373, and his fine manly figure. Renan p. 403.

† Cf. already Tac. Hist. 5, 6.: corpora hominum salubria et ferentia laborum, Also Phil. p. 173. Celsus indeed finds that neither in size nor beauty, strength, voice, imposing or persuasive manner was he pre-eminent. 6, 75. Hase, p. 79 (because of Joh. xxiv. 14). Winer A. Jesus.

‡ Not even by the woman in Luke xi. 27.

gather in. His vigour of health is proved by the wearing restlessness of his life, and by the daily expendituro of strength both of body and mind, demanded by the stormy importunity of the mental and physical misery of Israel.

On the other hand there is just as little ground to infer from the cures of sickness which the subsequent narrative relates as wrought by him, that he possessed an extraordinary measure of electro-magnetic nervous force, as there is for attempting to prove from his sleeping on the sea, from his excitement when the cures pressed unduly upon him, or his strikingly rapid death, that there was any peculiar delicacy and susceptibility in his nature. His cures, after all he wrought primarily by his word alone, and these cases of exhaustion of a strength that was mighty in the main, were brought to pass by stress of doing and of suffering.

To this young Israelite, with all that he had and was in his inner spiritual world, the outer world must needs be putting the question of a calling with ever increasing urgency at every step.

It is, to begin with, in a high degree likely that Jesus early busied himself in the little outer world of his father's calling. The Old Testament itself favoured the work of the hands, especially the tilling of the ground, which appears even by the pages of Josephus to have been still the chief employment of the people: even the Essenes, even the Pharisees, loved peaceful handiwork as a means of winning bread and of forgetting their sins. In this way Paul was a tent-maker and a missionary at the same time. Indeed it is a saying of the Rabbis: Whoso teacheth not his son some handiwork, doth as though he should train him for a robber.* The calling of a carpenter mentioned by the second

* Cf. Gen. xx. 12; xxiii. 10 ff. and see Jos. c. Ap. 1, 12. *χώραν ἀγαθὴν νεμόμενοι ταύτην ἐκπονοῦμεν*. Jochanan B. Sakkai shoemaker, Sim. B. Shetach carpet maker. Paul, Acts xviii. 3. Tos. in Kidd. 1: quicumque filium suum non docet

Gospel, then by Justin Martyr in the second century, finally by the world of apocryphal Gospels, which instance jobs small and large, ploughs, yokes, thrones and couches, and, may be, even houses,—assumed too in the scorn of Celsus,—is not quite beyond question, inasmuch as it is just as possible that the first source of the opinion, namely, Mark, may have altered the “son of the carpenter” of Matthew into “the carpenter,” in conformity with the later belief in a miraculous birth, as it is that Matthew or a younger recension of Matthew, should have altered the scandalizing “carpenter” into “carpenter’s son.”

Moreover, the Gnostic Justin drew the Jesus of twelve years as a shepherd, without however seriously claiming historical reality for his attractive picture.* Still the former kind of calling, although nowhere indicated in the discourses of Jesus, has the support partly of the tradition, not resting of necessity solely on Mark, which is found with Justin Martyr, who even at his baptism makes Jesus both carpenter’s son and carpenter,—partly of the inveterate custom of the East of passing on the employment of the father to the son, so that even the late History of Joseph has perhaps hit the truth when it makes out the other sons of Joseph to have been also his helpmates in labour.† If in addition it is to be assumed that after the death of his father,

aliquod opificium, est ac si doceret eum latrocinium. P. A. 2, 2: pulcra est doctrina legis cum artificio aliquo adjuncto; nam labor utriusque oblivisci facit peccati.

* Mark vi. 3. Cf. Matt. xiii. 55. We must not overlook the fact that even Mark himself although he has not the Virgin birth, yet cherishes a mysterious view of the Person of Jesus: again that very old versions like the Itala, even in Mark read “carpenter’s son,” and that Orig. c. Cels. 6, 36 expressly denies that Jesus is anywhere in the Gospels called carpenter. Just. Mart. c. Tryph. 88: *τεκτονικά ἔργα εἰργάζετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὡν, ἀποτρα καὶ ζυγά*. Cels. Orig. c. Celsum 6, 36. Similarly Theodoret and Sozomen, cf. Hofmann, Ap. L. J. p. 2. Winer, Jesus. Otto on Tryph. 88. The apocryph. Gosp. above p. 139. f. Just. Philos. 3, 26.

† Ch. 2: abivit una cum filiis suis ad profess. suam artem exercendo fabri lignarii. In the discourses of Jesus passages like Matt. v. 35. vi. 27. vii. 13. 24. vii. 17. xii. 33. Luke xxiii. 31 would have to be made by sheer violence to point to his former calling.

whose dying pillow was smoothed, according to the History of Joseph, by his son's interpreting to him the secret of death, and of his victory over death, as well as by the promise to his father of an incorruptible body until the thousand years' reign, he being then a youth of nineteen years old,—if it be assumed, we say, that Jesus then entered on the duty of providing for the family, one may thus make his long persistence in the silence of his calling, and even, in fine, his celibacy quite humanly intelligible.* For the purposes of actual history none of these traditions stands firm; and for these latter facts she seeks yet other grounds.

In his outward calling his own proper calling could not be absorbed. True the former was no mockery of his Mission, which here, as nowhere else, has ennobled the earthly toil from which it emerged; and the ancient Church, especially Justin, saw, meaningly enough, in the ploughs and yokes, symbols of the higher righteousness of the kingdom of God.

But engagement in material labour afforded after all but a slender contribution to the health of this Spiritual Life, and measure and plumbline but a feeble practice in the Law and Discipline of God. The question was, could Jesus shut up within himself, like a thrifty householder, the Life of the Spirit that was in him, shut it up from the world, so as, happy in himself, to bestow on his surroundings only as much as would fall to their lot in the way of accidental and immediate intercourse with him, or indeed in the simple exercise of his external calling? The tendency to retirement was strongly stamped in his temperament, but still more strongly the impulse which drove him out into life. This trait was already given in the natural life of his soul; but, in addition, his kindling zeal for God, his flaming love for man, impelled him, as did also, among other outward incentives, the early awakened spirit of the Israelite commonwealth, the opposite influence here

* Hist. Jos. xii. ff. Winer, A. Jesus. Winer has the strange notion that Jesus during his ministry still plied his craft.

of the Pharisees, here of the Essenes, finally his view of the spiritual and physical destitution of his people, of Herodian and of Roman tyranny, the sighs for freedom of every sort, which he would be likely to hear loudest in Galilee—urging him into the thick of his people. “Separate not thyself from the congregation,” Hillel and Philo and even Josephus had said, and one of the earliest words of Jesus was, “Ye are the light of the world;” “A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid;” “Men do not light a candle to put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that it may give light to all that are in the house. So let your light shine before men!”*

But when was his time? He waited his time. To begin with, he himself, as even his further history shows, was not yet inwardly ready, and only as one who was ready and complete, not as a blind leader of the blind that they should fall into the ditch,—could he be his people’s leader, the Scribe furnished with the new and old treasures of the heart.†

Accordingly he waited, a lowly one; a learner of God, a believer in the higher “must” of divine guidance; he waited, rejecting “all thoughts of man,” verily, his was a lying still beside the drastic energy of John; as he waited for the outward and inward tokens of the Finger of God.‡ So he continued to stand in readiness, to learn and wait: and one of the slight tokens of this suspense was haply too his celibacy. With almost too much earnestness the question has been often put, why did Jesus remain unmarried?§ He has been accused of Essæism, he has been excused, *e.g.* by Clement of Alexandria, on the strength of his self-sufficiency as everlasting God, who needed no help, nor comfort of wife and children, and found in the

* Matt. v. 14 ff. Cf. Jos. c. Ap. 2, 23: ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς εὐχεσθαι δεῖ πρῶτον σωτηρίας, εἰς ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν. ἐπὶ γὰρ κοινωνίᾳ γεγόναμεν καὶ ταύτην ὁ προτιμῶν τοῦ καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ἰδίου μάλιστα εἴη θεῶ κεχαρισμένος. Philo, Vol. I. p. 280. Hillel P. A. II., 4: ne segreges te ab ecclesia.

† Luke vi. 39 f. Matt. xv. 14; xxiii. 16; xiii. 52.

‡ Cf. Matt. xvi. 21; xxvi. 54. τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων xvi. 23.

§ Cf. particularly Hase p. 137.

Church his bride: latterly by the lower expedients of circumstance, struggle, and the troubles of his calling.* And while Hase rested content with the explanation, that no heart of equal worth could be found to match with his, Opitz, Venturini, and Renan have thought of secret leanings towards Mary, or this and that Galilæan maiden, and finally Schulthess does not see why he should not really have been married.† Plainly this was not the case, and as plainly Jesus knew nothing either of insensibility to women's hearts, nor of the merely outward desire for purity of the Essenes. But neither was it the circumstances of the time, nor the laborious nature of his occupation, beginning as it did late enough,—that restrained him, but—if we would speak worthily—the zeal for the One Master, who could not be halved, who could have no treaty with the world, and who commanded to him as to none other, collectedness, urgent earnestness and readiness for the beckonings of God, forbade all distraction and earthly yieldings to repose beyond the span of the moment, out of which “for the sake of the kingdom of God” he afterwards aroused his disciples too.‡

In this sense too we must resolutely reject the opinion, that Jesus had been already at work before his baptism by John, or that perhaps he had waited for his thirtieth year to pass and for the Baptist to precede him before entering on his ministry, from any mere grounds of expediency or propriety. Even in the early Church it was thought possible and likely that the point where the Gospels commence, viz. his baptism by John, had been preceded by a period of activity on the part of Jesus of some duration, no longer to be accurately restored by history.§

* Clem. Strom. 3, 6, 49. Pott. p. 533. Venturini 1, 369 ff: he is not indifferent to such a woman, but he must to the fight—can grant but friendship—and a parting kiss!

† Venturini 1, 360 ff. Renan, p. 358 f. 379. (the young daughters who might have made up their minds to love him). Opitz and Schulthess in Hase p. 138.

‡ Only cf. Matt. vi. 24; viii. 20 ff; xix. 12, 21, 27. Also Renan p. 72.

§ Philastr. Har. 58. Gaudent. Brix. serm. III. p. 45 f.

The view was perhaps somewhat better than that of the Arabian Gospel of the Infancy, that Jesus from his 12th to his 30th year, had concealed his miraculous powers, and done nothing but pursue secret studies in the Law; for the first would seem to be after all but an arbitrary standstill, the second would have come nearer the truth, had not this Gospel to start with destroyed the belief in any need for Jesus to learn.* In later times not only Venturini and Renan, but even Hase and Schleiermacher have found Jesus ready for action, and actually at work, even before the baptism by John, and Schleiermacher in particular supposes, (and his opinion is the perfect reflex of himself) that the longing to impart himself to others would have sought for satisfaction and exercise before the period in question, that Jesus must have taught and worked wonders, and gathered disciples not exactly in public, and yet publicly after all; until with his entrance on his 30th year, the reputed year for becoming "a Master" in Israel, he no longer shrank from more complete publicity.† This opinion is as vague as it is unhistorical. The Gospels assert throughout the very opposite, and, dating the beginning of the ministry of Jesus, as they do, from the appearance of John the Baptist,

* Ch. liv.

† Renan p. 90 ff. 105. Hase p. 87. Schleiermacher p. 165 ff. 204. The 30th year of life was however by no means so hard and fast a line among the Jews, as Iren. Hær. 2, 22, 4 (and in modern times Paulus) regard it: *magistri ætatem perfectam habens* (30 years) *venit Hierusalem, ita ut ab omnibus juste audiret magister*.—*Magister ergo existens magistri quoque habebat ætatem*. One may, following the Old Testament, think chiefly of the Levites, to go no further, whose time of service is variously fixed at from 30-50 (Numb. iv. 3 ff.) but also from 25-30 (Numb. viii. 23 ff.) or again from the 20th to the 50th year (2 Chron. xxxi. 17; 1 Chron. xxiii. 24; Ezr. iii. 8). Of the priests the Gemarists assure us, none was admitted before the 20th year. Yet see Ant. 15, 3, 1. 3. Winer, *Priester*. Cf. too Pirk. Ab. 5, 21: *filius 30 annorum ad robur* (lakoach). 40 *ad prudentiam* (labinah), 50 *ad consilium* (la-ezah). Luke iii. 23 will have been thinking of the 30th year as the year of manly maturity: but he himself only puts "about" (Ir. 2, 22, 5 wrongly: *qui inciperet esse tanquam triginta annorum*). The question now remains, not only whether Luke hit the actual year, but still more whether Jesus laid upon himself the mechanical and needless restriction of the year.

considering the fact of the enormous spiritual agitation which was connected with the mission of the latter, they have all the probability on their side.

One genuine piece of proof besides is left us, which sets the entire silence of Jesus during this period in the clearest light. This is the appearance of Jesus in his native town in the first half of his ministry.* The great astonishment of his birth-place at his knowledge and power, standing as it did in utter contrast with his unpretending growth to maturity in Nazara, can only be explained by the fact that Jesus, in this his home, which he did not leave until the days of John the Baptist, had never made any considerable stir, and never taken a *public* stand.

* Matt. xiii. 54.

THIRD PART.

SELF-RECOGNITION AND DECISION.

FIRST SECTION.—THE NEW PROPHET IN ISRAEL.

Long already had Jesus, according to the account of the Gospels, entered the borders of manly maturity, whether with Luke we estimate his age at thirty, or with John at forty years, when under his very eyes, another, greeted with the sympathy of the entire people, took the same or a like task to that which perhaps was silently fermenting and working in the heart of the Nazarene, boldly and bravely in hand.* But Israel and the

* That Jesus (also Peter) had passed his 20th year is clear from Matt. xvii. 24 ff. cf. Ex. xxx. 14, that he was about 30 years old at John's baptism and the beginning of his ministry, Luke says (iii. 23), that during the time of his mission he was about 40 years (not yet fifty years) say the Jews, John viii. 57. For rightly has Irenæus 2, 22, 6 (*irrationabile enim est omnino, &c.*) insisted that the Jews could not possibly in the interests of their opposition have made him much (say 20 years) older than he was. Which account shall we follow? The Church in the person of Irenæus believed the Johannine. Jesus was senior in senioribus, his *ætas* provector, *magis necessaria et magis honorabilis* as opposed to the *Juventus* (30-40); here is found the fine significance; *per omnem venit ætatem, omnem ætatem sanctificavit* (*infans, juvenis, senior*): Irenæus assures us, the abundant oral tradition of the Apostle John and all the Apostles point to such an age (40-50, nearer 50). Thus it comes to pass, that holding fast as he does the 30th year of baptism with Luke he must think of Jesus as really teaching 10-20 years long. From these and other reasons the Church has preferred the round number of 30 years; not only the Gnostics (*Ir. loc. cit.*), but also Clem. Tert. Jul. Afr. Orig. Eus. Lact., Ang. &c. (cf. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 236, note). It is hard to decide between these statements; both accounts may rest solely on conjecture and points of view. Cf. the Levite ages and P. A. 5, 21 p. 199, note. On the other side the 40th year of Moses and the Rabbis, Acts vii. 23. Lightf. p. 714. In the Gospels pleas for a younger age are: the fresh zealous energy (Matt. xi. 19 ff. xxi. 12; xxiii. 13 ff.), the strong recoil of his human nature from death, the band of fiery youthful Apostles that surround him, the deep warm sympathy of the people,

world had room for two men, nay for every soul that could come to the rescue: yes it was by a divine dispensation that they did so come together, in order with united strength to bring their nation and all history in train, and, set one on the shoulders of another, with mutually fortified entirety to define, ensure, and make more massive still, an undertaking whose end none could foresee. In point of fact, before the soft rustling of the Gospel's vernal breezes, there was need of the cutting sweeping storm of March in the preaching of the Baptist, and figures of speech aside, there was need of all the shaking, reviving, gathering might of a prophet, with all the old unbroken impetus of Israelitish inexorability, and mightiness in deed, in order to secure for the quietly pensive, contemplative, meek and lowly Witness of God's love, a belief in his mission

women and children (cf. Matt. xxvii. 55. Luke viii. 1 ff. xi. 27; xxiii. 27), still more his lively tenacity of family connexion (Matt. xii. 46), most of all the judgment of the Nazarenes on his entrance upon his career, when he is treated rather as one who is just outgrowing the restraints of home, than as one of long independent manhood xiii. 54. Ecclesiastical, but equally Schleiermacherian dogma, the general belief in a personality of genius, as well as the æsthetic interest, support obviously the younger age. For a riper age there are perhaps fewer concrete features that plead: say, the claim of Jesus to be one fully equipped (Luke vi. 40), the attitude of father of a household even toward the Apostles (Matt. x. 24 f. xxiii. 8 f), the treatment of people and Apostles as children (Matt. xi. 16, 19. John xxi. 5), the claim to be honoured more than father or mother (Matt. x. 37), the respect of the Scribes (xxii. 16 ff.) who nowhere ridicule his youth (Luke xviii. 18, 21; cf. Lightf. 714). But still more does the uncommon maturity of his experience, of his psychology, his public appearance, his training as a teacher (cf. Matt. x. 16; xv. 14) plead for it. The rest of the New Testament gives no firm basis for inference, not even Gal. iv. 4 f. Eph. iv. 13. A certain result is evidently no longer attainable. The reasons for and against are divided, and objections can always be answered. Were one to say that Luke is somewhat older after all than the fourth Gospel, yet again it is obvious that the notice is here incidental, while the former employs zeal and artifice in restoring the stages of age (5th-9th month, 8th day, 12th year, 30th year). A certain preponderance in favour of the riper age results from a combination of the factual grounds with a tradition of the Church alone any longer earnestly espoused by Irenæus in his day, not however exactly infallible; as well as with the chronological observation that only an age of about 40 years makes it possible to push back the birth of Jesus from the third decade of the Church chronology in which his ministry and death fell, to the last years of King Herod, as demanded by the Gospel of Matthew.

and his people, and amongst that people a firm footing for himself.

The history of John the Baptist has in some sort the advantage over the life of Jesus himself, inasmuch as it is written on two pages, Christian and Jewish. Under the latter we understand not rabbinical tradition, although it has taken notice in some measure of John as well as Jesus, since it is unquestionably worthless here as there. But the historian of the Jewish people has given a prominent position to the new prophet in the history of that time, which is covered by the reign of the Emperor Tiberius, and his Palestinian protégé the Tetrarch Antipas of Galilee and Peræa; à propos of which are very important statements, still sadly undervalued however by Ewald, concerning his entrance on his career.* So too, moreover, not to speak of the Apocrypha, the New Testament is not sparing of statements about the Baptist. One and all the Gospels have given some account of him, the third going back to his birth. Even the Acts of the Apostles has from time to time inserted Johannine reminiscences, and most of all Jesus in discourses which attest their own credibility, has pictured the great forerunner in faithful and sublime delineation, before the people, before the disciples, and before his adversaries at Jerusalem, as no Gospel has done.† Abundant are the historical traits thus preserved to us, and the full guarantee of our assurance is given by the undesigned coincidence of Josephus and the Gospels, notwithstanding all their independence and variation. Nevertheless there still broods not only over the birth and youth of John, but also over his prophetic exaltation, most of all in fine over his meeting with Jesus, a darkness both of silence and legendary loquacity, which historic

* Rabbin. accounts Othon. lex. rabb. 324. Mad fables in the Toledoth: cf. below. Ewald's utterances p. 124 f. 129. This estimate is most sensibly avenged in the chronology. Jos. Ant. 18, 5, 2.

† Apart from the ev. opening narratives cf. Matt. xiv. 1-13; Mark vi. 14-29; Acts i. 5; x. 37; xiii. 25; xix. 4. Then very specially the speeches of Jesus, Matt. xi. 2-19; xvii. 12-13; xxi. 23-32.

examination can only with much trouble, and never fully, break through.

I.—THE HISTORY OF JOHN THE BAPTIST'S ANTECEDENTS.

The birth of John the Baptist is even by our Gospels embowered in a wreath of legend, like the birth of Jesus himself; yes, legendary musing has made the two mighty ones of Israel who met as men, kindred, as in spirit, so in blood, even in the cradle, nay even in the womb. True it is only the single, and recent Gospel of Luke, which in the introduction to its history of Jesus dispenses these pictures from a Jewish source: the other Gospels, especially Matthew, have only known and described John at the height of his activity.

In order to fill out empty spaces in history, and, perhaps still more, in order to enjoy a beautiful recital, we first grasp eagerly at the facts of this third Gospel. In the mountains of Judah southward from Jerusalem, in the town of Judah, that is, in all probability, in the primeval, patriarchal, kingly and priestly town of the tribe of Judah, Hebron, the first royal residence of David, there lived in the days of Herod the Great the priestly wedded pair, pious in legal observance, Zacharia and Elisheba (Elisabeth).* Zacharia belonged to the course of Abijah, from the Aaronic chief line of Eleazar, the eighth among

* Luke i. 5 ff. The town is called πόλις Ιούδα (ἐν τῇ ὁρεινῇ) i. 39. It is impossible from the context to translate with Bleek a town; it must be *the* town. Winer is willing at least to allow this translation. But if there was no town Judah, we can only think of a town of the tribe of Judah, and indeed a town of some fame in the mountain country, and at the same time probably a town of the Priests, which only Hebron was, Josh. xxi. 11 (in opposition to Winer). Thus Beza, Grotius, Lightf. Also Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* 1st Ed. p. 28 has assumed Hebron. The Rabbis too think of Hebron (*Othon. lex. rabb.* 324). On the other hand Reland, Valesius, Kuinöl, Paul., Winer, Robins., Renan think of the priestly town of Jutha or Juttha (Rob. 2, 417), two leagues S. of Hebron Joshua xv. 55; xxi. 16. The Greek form in Eus. *Ἰερράν*, Sept. *Ἰρά* (*Ταύ*). Now-a-days the village Jutta, acc. to Seetzen Jitta. But merely philologically this is not possible, and as regards the facts the place is too obscure for Luke to have introduced it without comment.

four-and-twenty ; the wife too came, as the writer emphatically records, so fond were the priests of union with the purest blood, of priestly Aaronic race.* Vain was her prayer for the blessing of children ; Elisheba was barren ; both had grown old. Then the alternating service of the priesthood brought the course (Ephemeria) of Abijah for a week into the Temple. By lot probably the day fell to the house of Zachariah, and to himself the office of offering incense in the Holy Place, which brought the priest nearest to God, and was hence looked on as a special piece of good fortune, as a means of Revelation, though under certain circumstances equally of divine judgment.† Then there appeared to him on the right of the altar of incense, on the auspicious side, an Angel of the Lord, and announced in terms quite similar to those used formerly in addressing Samson's parents, the fulfilment of his petition to the awe-struck priest ; a son, a *Jochanan* (in Greek, *Johannes*) *i. e.* a gift of God, a namesake of many great ones, especially of the Hasmonæan John Hyrcanus—shall be born of Elisheba, a joy to many, mighty before the Lord, a Nazarite and man of the Spirit from the womb, a turner of many hearts in Israel, a restorer, an Elijah as the prophets had spoken, a forerunner of the Lord.‡

* Cf. 1 Chron. xxiv. 10. After the Exile the name from the first occurs no longer and is not to be confounded with the impure priestly family Chabajah Ezra ii. 61. Yet cf. Jos. Ant. 7, 14, 7. Priestly marriages Jos. c. Ap. 1, 7. Also Ant. 13, 10, 5. Above, Vol. I. p. 296. In itself marriage with the daughters of any tribe was allowed the priests, but Luke and Josephus show the prevailing custom.

† Cf. Deut. xxxiii. 10. Antiq. 13, 10, 3. Misfortune from nearness of God, Judges vi. 23. A long stay in the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement is related of Simon the Just : he prayed that the Sanctuary might not be destroyed. Herzfeld, 3, 245 cf. Winer Art. Priester.

‡ The word of the Angel is in allusion to Mal. iii. and Isa. xl. But still more cf. the history of Samson, Judges xiii. 1 ff. The name *Johannes*, Hebr. *Jochanan* Talm. also *Jochanna*, *Jochane*, Greek Sept : *Ἰωαννάν*, Jos. and New Testament gener. *Ἰωάννης*, uncommonly frequent, still more so than the name of Jesus, cf. only Josephus in Dindorf, the Rabb., also Ewald p. 125. Cf. *Ἰάκκωχος* (Sorcerer) 2 Tim. iii. 8. Winer, A. Jambres. Akin is also the name [H]annah [H]annas. The name *Jannæus* (*Ἰανναῖος*, *Ἰάννατος*, *Ἰαννέας*), chiefly known through the King Alexander (besides cf. the Tarichæan Vit. 26) is probably still more directly connected : originally most likely=Son of John=Johnson (cf. John Hyrcanus).

In doubt the old man craves a sign: he must be his own sign, for the angel who makes himself known as Gabriel (Man of God), one of the seven archangels, announces to him, as the penalty of his unbelief, dumbness until the fulfilment. To the expectant people who were fain to throng the way by which the priest approached God's presence, when at length he issued forth, he could only recount by signs the Revelation which his long tarrying in the Temple had half led them to conjecture.*

Elisheba soon experienced the divine blessing. Thankful to God, who had taken from her the contempt of men, she hid herself from human ken five months, vowing beforehand the child of her womb, as it were, of her own accord, protecting it from all pollution in order to bring it to the Purest—a pure offering. One is reminded of similar features in the apocryphal Gospel, where the infant Mary, through the watchful care of her mother Anna, does not leave the sanctuary of the house until she enters the sacred precincts of the Temple. In the sixth month there appeared at the house of Elisheba, after a hurried journey of three days from Nazara, the Virgin Mary, the mother of Jesus, who had herself but now received a visit from the Angel Gabriel, and his promise of a Messiah-son to sit on David's throne for ever; and, in answer to her doubtful question, had been pointed to the power of the Holy Ghost, and the sign which God had given to the wife of the Priest. Scarcely had the word of greeting reached Elisheba's ear when the child leaped for joy in her womb, like a servant welcoming his Lord; Elisheba, full of the Holy Ghost, added her joyous recognition of the truth, and called Mary blessed among women, the mother of a blessed offspring, the mother of her Lord. Beneath the influence of this double and threefold sign, Mary is stirred to a fervid song of praise, after the pattern at once of Moses' song of victory by the Red Sea shore, and that

Egypt might be recalled by the word *'Iavlaç* (a king) Jos. c. Ap. 1, 14: acc. to some also the name of the sorcerer. Fables about the change of the name Jochanan to Johannes by Jesus Hist. Jes. 36.

* Cf. Vol. I. p. 297.

of Hanna, once the barren, then the happy mother of Samuel in the sanctuary at Shiloh. She extolled her salvation, the happiness of the poor handmaid, henceforth called blessed by all generations: the mighty deeds of God who kept faith with the faithful; his principle of putting to shame—yea, dethroning—the great, even potentates upon their thrones, through that which is small; the truthfulness of God, who fulfils his word in Israel, his servant, in Abraham and his seed for ever.* Mary remained three months; so even before the birth the children grew up together, who as men were to work for each other.

Immediately afterwards Elisheba bare her son. On the eighth day he was circumcised: the neighbours and kinsfolk wanted to give him the name of the father, as was so often done. But the mother, who in other cases too had not seldom the casting vote in giving a name, desired, as though miraculously prompted, the name of John. The final decision was sought for at the hands of the father.† Thereupon he wrote on a tablet, "His name is John," and straightway his mouth was opened to the amazement of all, far or near, and a prophetic, chiefly Isaianic, Song of Praise poured forth from his lips, extolling the age of the Messiah, fraught with deliverance from the hands and hatred of foes, and with forgiveness, holiness and righteousness; finally a prophecy of his son's mission as Elias.‡

Even the apocryphal Gospels have not found much more to add to these recitals. In the first place it was but a comparatively feeble interest which was enlisted on the side of the

* Luke i. 46-55. Therewith Gen. xv. 1 Sam. i. 2. Cf. note below; also Gen. xxx. 13. 1 Sam. i. 11. Gal. iii. 16.

† Naming of Children after the father cf. Jos. Ant. 14, 1, 3. Tob. i. 9, also the family of Antipater and Herod. Right of the mother Gen. xxix. 32 ff.; xxxv. 18. 1 Sam. i. 20; iv. 21. Kindred, Ruth, iv. 17.

‡ *a.* Salvation in the Messiah, v. 63-71. *b.* Fulfilment of the promise, v. 72-73. *c.* Blessedness of Israel, v. 73-75. *d.* John's forerunnership, v. 76-77. *e.* God's gracious will, v. 78-79. Cf. therewith Isa. ix. 2; xl. 3; lx. 1. Also Num. xxiv. 17. Jer. xxiii. 5. Zech. iii. 8; vi. 12.

Baptist and his parents ; and in the second the communication made by Luke satisfied even the furthest stretch of curiosity, with its persons, its tableaux and its mysteries. Nevertheless, the Gospel according to James, at all events, manifestly proceeding on Luke's groundwork, has added a few novel and for the most part intensifying features. Zacharia is high-priest : as such he entered the Holy of Holies in the sacred attire of his office, at the request of the priests, in order to inquire the will of God with regard to the future of Mary, a child of twelve years old, brought up in the Temple ; and it was by his arrangement, that, by means of a sign given him by the Angel of God, Mary was consigned to Joseph's hands. He it is again who immediately afterwards assigns by lot to the Virgin Mary the task of weaving purple into a veil for the Temple, and is then in a mysterious manner stricken dumb for a season, so that the office devolves upon another (Samuel).* In a new way too Mary now comes to Elisheba, not by reason of a Revelation of the Angel, who says nothing about Elisheba, but on the occasion of her delivering her woven work in Jerusalem, and taking the opportunity to visit her kinsfolk. Mary has only to knock at the door, and Elisheba throws down her work, and hastens to meet her, and scarcely catches sight of her, when she salutes her as the mother of her Lord ; for the child in her womb has leapt in Mary's honour. But she, the lowly handmaid of the Lord, has herself forgotten the word of Gabriel, and asks, with a glance of infinite surmise to heaven in answer to the blessing first of the High Priest and now of Elisheba, " Who am I, Lord, that all generations of the earth should bless me ?" For a quarter of a year she lives in Elizabeth's house while the blessing is growing within her, and then hastens home.†

After John and Jesus were born, they experience a common danger and a common deliverance. The murder of the children by Herod, narrated in Matthew, threatens John

* 2 Ch. viii-x. Cf. p. 73 f.

† Ch. xii.

far more seriously than Jesus, because the foolish tyrant, blinded by God, sees in John the Messiah.

Mary lays her child in the manger, but Elisheba hears that search is being made for John ; she flees with him into the mountains, to the stones of the wilderness, among which John afterwards wanders. Finding no refuge, she calls to the mountain, "Mount of God, receive the mother with her child !" and the mountain splits, receives her, and a gleam of light shining through betrays the Angel of God that protects them. But the tyrant sends envoys to Zacharia demanding, "Where hast thou hidden thy son?" Zacharia, serving in the Temple, knows not where he is. Herod is wroth ; he knows the son is to be king in Israel, and demands truth or death. Thus Zacharia was murdered in the Temple, by the altar of sacrifice, by the veil of the Holy of Holies, whose purple Mary had woven. As he did not come out, at last a priest made his way in ; then his blood streamed forth, and a voice called : his blood shall not be wiped away until his avenger come. Now all entered. The coverings of the Temple shrieked, the men rent their clothes : the body they found not, but his blood, turned to stone. For three days all Israel mourned. Symeon succeeded to the office ; he who was not to see death until he had seen Christ in the flesh.*

It is, we presume, superfluous to pursue critically these later narratives further ; they are an arbitrary though not wholly unideal mixture and fantastic extension of our Gospels, as well as of the accounts in the Old Testament, the Gospels and the writings of the Rabbis about the death of an old prophet Zacharia, who was confounded with the father of John.† Even

* xxii-xxiv. The death of Zacharia is according to the whole narrative (spite of the *πρόθυρα ναοῦ*) thought of not as before the Temple, but before the Holy of Holies : even in chapter viii. the idea is that the altar of sacrifice stood in the Holy Place, or actually in the Holy of Holies. As is well known the altar of burnt offerings stood in the forecourt, the altar of incense in the Holy Place.

† 2 Chron. xxiv. 21. Matt. xxiii. 35. Rabbinical notices in Hofmann L. J. nach den Apokr. p. 139.

the Gnostics and the Church teachers told various fables about this man.* On the other hand we are not inclined to skim so rapidly over the story of our third Gospel. Strict history, however, no one can find here. First of all there is the silence of the other Gospels concerning this new wonder-world surrounding the youth of its hero, and only the late source of a late Gospel vouches for it. Matthew contradicts it at once in his opening history. Mary never left Nazara; Mary is so much in sole possession of her secret, that not even Joseph knows it, not to speak of her distant kindred. Still more is it in contradiction with the later actual history. Of wonders connected with John's youth as little is known to the people as of wonders in his maturity, although the former according to the narrator were talked of far and wide.† John too remembers as a man no divine marvels, which would irrevocably have linked him with Jesus: he gains his belief in Jesus according to the Gospels for the first time under the influence of the signs at his baptism, and a little later he has doubts about Jesus.‡ A kinship between Jesus and John is nowhere indicated; indeed, according to the fourth Gospel, they were entire strangers to each other until they met at the Jordan.§ Finally, the abstinence of a Nazarite on the part of John, a servile, fettered piety from childhood onwards, customary as it was in that age, is altogether at variance with the free heroism of his rigour towards himself and others, which it is meant to explain, but ill explains after all.|| Besides the history shows striking improbabilities. The three days' journey of a woman in such a condition has nothing in its favour. The doubting question

* Hofmann p. 138. On the Gnostic *γέννα Μαρίας* cf. Tischendorf, Ev. 31.

† Cf. John x. 41. Luke i. 65.

‡ Matt. iii. 13 ff. xi. 1 ff. John i. 33.

§ Cf. Matt. xi. 1 ff. John i. 31 ff. On Matt. iii. 14 see below.

|| Matt. ix. 14 ff. xi. 7-10; 18. *Ναζαραῖτοι* Ant. 4, 4, 4. *Ναζιραῖτοι* 19, 6, 1. Here it is said of Agrippa I: *Ν. ξυρᾶσθαι διέραξε μάλα συχνοῦς* i.e. he defrayed the costs, like Paul Acts xxi. 23 ff. Cf. Vol. I. p. 299. With that word of course the *Ναζωπαῖτος* of the New Testament p. 16 (even as early as Cels. Orig. c. l. 7, 18) has often enough been confounded.

of Zacharia appears when compared with like questions by Abraham and even by Mary, to have been punished with inconceivable severity.* The speeches of the Angel, and of the men, in texts out of the Old Testament, most of all those material thoughts of the Messiah in their Ebionitish hue, in the mouths of both alike ; finally, the agreement of the course of events with the birth of Samson the Nazarite and of Samuel, betrays human authorship. Nor let us pass in silence by the strongest improbabilities of all, the destruction of the whole ground of reality by a crushing weight of supernatural marvel. The angelic appearance is but the least of these wonders ; but itself only to be explained by Judæism, and that of a late date, with its names and appearances of angels, and its material localizations of God's Revelation. But, to crown all, the miraculous augury and foreknowledge of Elisheba, and even of the unborn child, concerning Mary's secret, even the angel-message she had had, the Messianic greatness of her Son, the name and destiny of her own ; finally, the clear and certain knowledge of Mary herself and of Zacharia, who so suddenly turns prophet, concerning the dawn of the era of Salvation ; a certainty that afterwards was only won even for Mary in severest spiritual conflict ; all these are just as much suspensions, which speak for themselves, of the regular human course of a spiritual process, without the mediation of any cause, even where it readily offers ; as, on the other hand, the succession of miraculous births, the excitement and emotion in the souls of embryos, the speechlessnesses and powers of speech, cannot be called anything but most daring disturbances of Nature's method of procedure. But all is good, and all is full of meaning, if only we do not haggle for history, and do but revere the pious poetry as it streams from the same Jewish national spirit, as that which in the book of Sohar, in speaking of the wonders done at the Red Sea, makes bold to tell of embryos that in the womb were fellow-witnesses of the mighty

* Gen. xv. 2, 8. Luke i. 29, 34 cf. v. 12, 18.

deeds of God, and praised him for the same.* Here is history of a higher sort. Even the great forerunner must in accordance with his name (God-granted), to go no further, have owed his existence to a great deed of God, and forerunner and king, kindred at the outset, must in childhood already have known, have greeted each other, have been companions together, and must in proportion to their greatness, have lifted in childhood already to surrounding eyes the veil that shrouded their future with no timid nor uncertain hand.

If with a housekeeper's thrift we would weigh how much of these records may haply be held fast, what most commends itself as credible is that John—for this name is assured beyond all doubt by the discourses of Jesus and by Josephus—that John was a native of Judæa, that he was the son of Zacharia, and the son of a priest. The first follows pretty much from the third, as well as from the subsequent Judæan activity of John, the second and third might, nay must have been easily preserved in the people's memory, inasmuch as custom was fond of naming the father, as well as the class he belonged to. He would be called in the people's mouth simply Jochanan ben Zacharia hakohen.† Doubt might urge the objection, it lay near at hand, straightway and without more ado to tack on to one great in Israel the priestly origin so highly revered; or actually to conceive the brilliant device of painting in lively hues the contrast between birth and deed, the Priest and the Essene, the hierarch and the foe of hierarchs; but why after all in case of free invention was not Jesus above all made the son of a priest? And why did the freely plastic legend in seeking such antecedents for John, not emulate above all the derivation of his prototypes Samson and Samuel?‡ Somewhat less reliable and

* Soh. Ex. in Meyer on Luke 1, 41: omnes Israelitæ ad mare rubrum plus viderunt quam Ezechiel propheta: imo etiam embryones, qui in utero matris erant viderunt id et Deum S. B. benedixerunt.

† Cf. Matt. xiii. 55. Matt. xxi. 32 also points to Judæan origin.

‡ Dignity of the priesthood (cf. Vol. I. p. 297). Jos. Vit. 1: παρ' ἡμῖν ἡ τῆς ἱερωσύνης μετουσία τεκμήριόν ἐστι γένους λαμπρότητος. Josephus boasts not only

yet not wholly incredible is the name of the mother : this it was not quite so customary to preserve ; and here we have the remarkable phenomenon, that she the daughter of Aaron shares the significant name of Elisheba (God the Oath) whose meaning the story itself appears to explain anew, with the wife of Aaron herself.*

Most unreliable perhaps is the relationship to Jesus, although it is vouched for not only by Luke, but also by the Gospel of James, and the History of Joseph, furnished in later Church history with a genealogical foundation, and by some modern writers is not only maintained but even used to explain the subsequent appearance together of the two men, yes even the birth of Jesus.† The historical and mental meeting-point between Israel's two greatest men, is here, in this isolated account of Luke, as is so often the case in history, depicted in carnal lineaments. Why even in the immediate neighbourhood of these surroundings of New Testament recital, and in just the same manner, Jesus and John the son of Zebedee, yes the two Johns, or Peter and Paul have been brought together as blood relations, or at least companions in travel, and colleagues in the mission field.‡

The youthful development of John has been portrayed in a highly peculiar manner, no less short than sharp and characteristic, by Luke, who describes his birth. "The child grew and

that he was the son of priests, but also that he belonged to the first priestly class. Ib. Cf. c. Ap. 2, 21. Jer. xviii. 18. Sir. vii. 31, 33.

* Ex. vi. 23. Elisheba=God oath, one whose vow or confession is God ; but acc. to i. 73 still more : she in whose person God keeps oath.

† Hist. Joseph. viii. : Johannes amicus et cognatus meus. The genealogy in Niceph. H. E. 2, 3 : Salome, Elisabeth, Maria, daughters of the three daughters of the priest Matthan and a Mary. Hofmann p. 85. The modern romance in Paulus and Venturini 1, 115, ff. 273 ff. Above p. 78. Cf. on Paulus, Strauss N. L. J. p. 17.

‡ Salome the mother of John the son of Zebedee was made now a daughter of Joseph, the fosterfather of Jesus (Epiph. 78, 8), now his wife (Nic. 2, 3), now even a daughter of Zacharia's brother, now a cousin of Elisabeth and Mary. Cf. Winer, Salome. See also last note. Petrus et Paulus is the ecclesiastical legend carried out with peculiar energy in the Acta P. et P.

waxed strong in spirit and was in the wilderness, until the day of his showing unto Israel." By this day of his showing to Israel nothing else can be understood but the public appearance of John in the name of God, which is afterwards detailed.* But the abode in the wilderness is evidently in the mind of the writer not to be restricted to a short period before his entrance on his public career, but is thought of as extending from early youth to maturity. The mere expression naturally suggests this interpretation, and we should have to assume a very carelessly inaccurate recital, would we believe, that John was suddenly transplanted by the writer from the time of his childhood to that of his manhood in the wilderness without more ado. This is all the less credible, because the view of the narrator, as it lies before us, has something striking, and therefore taking, in it; the subsequently inexorable foe of the prevalent state of things, the serious grave ascetic in the wilderness, must from youth upwards have broken with society, and have closed a covenant with the seers of the wild.

Indeed the author and the source he drew from understood still more under this form of narration. The abode in the wilderness from youth upwards is in a line with the pious retirement of his mother before his birth, only to be broken by the arrival of the mother of Messiah at the priestly house. Here is a view of life tending towards Essæism. John is the pure and perfect Nazarite, and thus the worthy prophet of God, only so far as before and after birth he is withdrawn from the profane world. And John too is the genuine full forerunner and preparer of the way for Messiah, only in proportion as his path in life converges step by step with that of Messiah, rather than of any other, first in the priestly house, afterwards on the skirts of the wilderness, by Jordan. The more strongly and overpoweringly this higher point of view comes out, all the more calmly may we waive any literal historical validity in this account of an early life in the desert, without thinking it worth

while to ask whether this retirement took place, perhaps not quite at the beginning indeed, but at all events not so long afterwards. Our view of the youth of John, even though all sources should desert us, must manifestly be fixed quite independently of sources like these. Doubtless John to begin with grew up with the legal piety of his time. As the son of a priest his life would be inured to the contemplation of Jerusalem, the Temple, and the holy sacrifices. The sacred rule of living, he would become acquainted with, was the Law, and the exposition of the Law was given him by those who wholly controlled in Judæa the aspirations of ardent youth, namely the Scribes. Whether he attended one of their schools we do not know; though at least it is likelier than in the case of Jesus, since no early account hinders the assumption, while the father's station and the vicinity of Jerusalem favour it; and at any rate it is plain that he appropriated their principles of righteousness before God, strict purifications, washings, fasts, devotional exercises, works of piety and giving of alms.*

On the showing of the Gospels themselves his disciples at one time associated with the Pharisees, at another the Pharisees associated with his disciples in religious fellowship, and Jesus himself passed a general censure on the piety of both as consisting in obsolete external forms, all the more because he recognized therein a vain patching of the old garment.† This legality and more than legality in John pursued the same lofty aims which the Scribes promised and strove for, the coming of the kingdom of God whose name he took from their lips, and which he longed for the more yearningly the nearer and more oppressive appeared the misery of his people beneath the foreign yoke, beneath the procurator, the legions, the heathen, from day to day before his eyes.‡

* Matt. ix. 14 ff.; xi. 19; iii. 4. Luke v. 33 ff. (fasting, prayers, alms, good works). Washings one may believe in in view of his baptism, Righteousness Matt. xxi. 32, and Josephus.

† Matt. ix. 14 ff. Luke v. 33 ff. Matt. xxi. 32 is hardly to be placed in this line. Cf. with it v. 20; vi. 33.

‡ On his subsequent call to the kingdom (Matt. iii. 2) see below.

But John did not rest satisfied with the age as he found it. The powers of his richly furnished mind, whose privilege it was to be to speak to his age with all the courage and soaring fervour of an ancient prophet, we can no longer portray with any exactness, because we can but discern his form so far in the distance: but this one mighty impression is made on us as he steps forth into view; he was a man of the most vivid moral feeling, devoid of all artifice, full of a sense of truth, full of active impulse, and thus likewise from youth upwards in the best place as the appointed critic of his time, the conscience of Israel in defiance of all shows and shams, all idle self-soothing, such as that into which even the most zealous piety of his surroundings was wont to lull itself. The sacrificial service of Jerusalem, which he carefully regarded, unblinded by the spirit of caste, made on him with its mechanical observance no impression of adequate performance, or even of worthy intention. The dominant Sadducæan high-priests, the Annases, and Caiaphases he loathed still more than did the people. In the new Pharisaic hierarchy, he was never tired of espying underneath the mantle of purity and behind their cheap popular reputation for sanctity, the abominations of ambition, greed and hypocrisy. Moreover the entire people, as it was, pleased him not. He did not find that the earnestness of the time was seriously knocking at its heart, while it sought to get over the same by a few scraps of Pharisaic piety, and with a brutally exaggerated selfish sense of being "the People of God."* With the utterances of his own nobly organized nature the witness of the prophets of the Old Testament must early enough have allied themselves. He found in their deep and holy zeal for Israel and for Israel's God, in their loving anger on behalf of a higher righteousness of heart and life in place of a dead service of sacrifice, in their sublime message concerning God's future for a pious people worthy of their God, the echo of a prophetic desire and foretelling in his

* These features are founded on Matt. iii. 7 ff. Luke iv. 7 ff.

own soul. At least as he enters on his career he shows us plainly that he had busied himself thoroughly with the prophets, chiefly Isaiah, leaving Moses, whom he never names, far behind in the background ; and Jesus himself with a tact that bade fair to shame and convince, subsequently cast in the teeth of his doubts the Prophet Isaiah, as one whom the Baptist must needs know, understand and believe.*

The task he recognized it behoved him to fulfil, without looking right or left, first of all in himself. He was the nearest to himself, and his spiritual might reached in the first instance no further than his own person. With the sufferings and the longings of Israel upon his soul he fled from Israel's pollution, the heathen potentate, into the wild. That he not only made his first appearance in the wilderness, but that before his entry on his public career, he had lived there for some time in solitude, we shall find established, apart from the Gospel according to Luke, by the whole of his subsequent procedure, by his manner of life, by his sad seriousness, and even by that bold resolve to be a prophet, which can hardly have been brought to maturity amid the distractions and discouragements of life's turmoil, as it might amid the solemn and liberating stillness of the desert. This retirement into the wilderness did not make him forthwith an Essene ; as, like Jesus, he, by many, even the Jewish historians of to-day, in some sort too by Renan, and most of all by Venturini is supposed to have been ; yet he betook himself to a manner of life, such as at that time had been brought into fashion most of all by the Essenes.† True, as we saw, the Essenes of Palestine dwelt as a rule together in towns

* The baptism of John, his language (Generation of vipers cf. Isa. lix. 5. God's planting cf. Isa. v. 7. Trees vi. 13 ; x. 15 : xviii. 33 f. ; xl. 24. Fire i. 31 ; ix. 18 ; x. 17 ; v. 24 ; xlvii. 14. Threshing-floor, winnowing fan, xxi. 10 ; xxviii. 27 f. xxx. 24 ; xl. 24 ; xli. 15 f. Bread and clothes to the poor lviii. 7. Washing, Holy Ghost cf. below) all point to Isaiah. Therewith cf. John i. 23. Jesus' word Matt. xi. 5 goes back to Isaiah.

† Cf. Jost, Grätz, Renan (p. 97), on the other side Delitzsch, Jesus u. Hillel p. 24, Pressensé Jésus-Christ p. 292 and so many moderns besides, who cannot endure historical props for the Heads of Revelation. Cf. Uhlhorn, A. Essener.

and villages, but the desire for retirement which lay at the ground of their settlements must at least have driven individuals in early times into the complete solitude of the desert after the example of the Therapeutæ of Egypt. Not only did Pliny, about the year 70, find the Essenes in the wilderness, and indeed in the wilderness of Judæa by the Dead Sea, just where the Gospels too discover John: but already between 50 and 60 A.D., say twenty years after John, there lived without doubt in the same wilderness a hermit, Banus, according to Renan a follower of John, famed even at Jerusalem for his holy life, for his cold ablutions by day and night, for his garb of natural growth made from the bark of trees, and for his food, the raw fruits of the desert.

His reputation allured disciples to his side, even from families of standing; the historian Josephus, not so entirely satisfied as yet with the three religious parties, shared with him from his sixteenth to his nineteenth year his hard asceticism.* Like this Banus, who was no Essene (as Josephus plainly writes) and yet one spiritually allied to the Essenes, shall we have to think of John in his desert life. Of his entrance into the order there is not the trace of an historic intimation, and John's leaning towards his people and a kingdom of God in the people's midst, his subsequent preaching to the people, his sympathy even for publicans, and sinful men and women, whom the Essene fled, his diet in its very singularity, including a feeding on flesh; then again his fasting, his baptism in water once for all instead of the daily washings, all this speaks against it, and proves his independence of the order: so that even the champions of his regular rank have been compelled to speak of his subsequent emancipation, which with the iron fetters of Essæism was after all not possible.† A fellow he is not, but a near

* Jos. Vit. 2. He speaks of a *σκληραγωγία* and *πόνοι πολλοί* on this tour of about 4 years c. ann. 52-55. Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 27. Renan 104. 203. Cf. above p. 160.

† Cf. Venturini 1, 380 ff. Acc. to him John too, although far otherwise than Jesus a strict Essene, had still the impulse, to work upon the people beyond the Essenes.

ally he is, nearer beyond comparison than Jesus, but weaker too : the principle of retirement which he scarcely learnt alone from the prophet Elijah,—of purity, of celibacy, of abstinence, of prophetic righteousness, of personal moral struggle and wrestling, instead of cheap “divine service,” he in some sort shared with these logically consequent Puritans : and even the baptism which he so independently instituted permits the assumption, that he began with external washings which his standpoint did not shut out, and which were recommended at the outset by Pharisaic custom, and that he ended with the decisive washing of consecration. In this free alliance he took up his solitary abode in the desert, after previously inspecting, esteeming, but avoiding the Essenes and their life ; and in this freedom he planted a deed in the desert, by which the nation trembled into life, while all Essæism left it dead, because it had itself taken leave of life.

The wilderness of Judæa in which John hid himself, the largest Jewish desert, extended under many names over the whole eastern portion of the tribe of Judah, of which it might perhaps include an entire third. Even beyond Judah and the brook Kedron it continued northwards into the territory of the tribe of Benjamin under the new name of the wilderness of Jericho.* It is geographically speaking nothing else than the sloping down of the limestone mountain range of central Palestine into the basin of the lower Jordan and the Dead Sea, into which the wall formed by the mountain land of Judah after reaching an elevation of 3000 feet to the south-west by Hebron, falls with a declivity of 1000 to 1500 feet. This mountain highland is beyond everything rugged and dreary ; full of bare rocks, rich in hollows, in which of old David hid himself from the face of Saul, as well as of sandy plains ; so that for far, as Jerome writes, no village, no farm is to be seen, at most some shepherds with their flocks, who also gave their name to the

* Wilderness of Juda, midbar Jehuda Joshua xv. 61 f. Wilderness of Jericho Joshua xvi. 1. Cf. Winer and Herzog, *Art. Wüsten*.

water-springs. So Engedi means the "Goat-fountain." The vegetation has for the most part found refuge in the small valleys formed by the tolerably numerous mountain streams; valleys, some of which wind away to the Dead Sea in wild and awful ravines.* Here at the mouth of these "Wadys" were situated those six towns and villages for the most part, which the book of Joshua assigns to the wilderness of Judah, especially the little town of Engedi, the centre of one of the eleven toparchies of Judæa, with about 1000 inhabitants, whose diligent horticulture amid a splendid southern vegetation is to this day revealed by re-discovered ruins which Seetzen, and most of all Robinson, has found.† Scarcely, however, can John have settled so far southwards, although Pliny points to colonies of the Essenes by the palmy Engedi; though far less, no doubt, as tradition would have it, in the neighbourhood of Ainkarim, two hours to the north-west of Bethlehem and the south-west of Jerusalem, where there is no wilderness at all; and nothing but fancy found an attraction in the vicinity of these two towns.‡ We must rather assume that the place of his hermit life lay in the neighbourhood of the spot where he afterwards baptized by the Jordan, accordingly, as we shall see, in the northernmost portion of the wilderness between Jerusalem and Jericho, through the horror of whose solitude David once sought escape from Absalom, and the unlucky King Zedekiah from the Babylonian.§ This desolate world was chosen by John spectator of his sacred offerings of purification and self-denial; he fasted, he ate and drank not; the gifts of the desert, locusts and wild honey (both common enough in this district, and the locusts to this day

* Jerome, Prol. in Amos: ultra (Thecoam) nullus viculus est, ne agrestes quidem casæ: et quia arida et arenosa, nihil omnino frugum gignitur, cuncta sunt plena pastoribus.

† Joshua xv. 61, 62. 1 Sam. xxiv. 1. Joseph Ant. 9, 1, 2. B. J. 4, 7, 2. Here the town is called *πολίχνη*, in the first passage *πόλις*, in Jerome *vicus prægrandis*. Cf. also Plin. H. N. 5, 15. Finally A. Engedi in Winer and Herzog.

‡ Cf. Winer, *Wüste*.

§ Cf. Jos. Ant. 10, 8, 2.

when well dressed no coarse fare), afforded him a scanty subsistence; his garment was that of poverty and penitence, a cloak of camel's hair with a broad leathern girdle. This description as given in the Gospels is vindicated from the charge of being a later invention of a prophet's array, by the genuinely ancient portraiture of John taken from the mouth of Jesus himself. One may compare this clothing, which he can scarcely have waited to don until his public appearance, with that of the prophets, especially Elijah, or with that of Egyptian Therapeutæ in their shaggy hides.*

But he can scarcely have imitated the latter, rather, if anything, the former: not, however, at the outset with a belief that he was a prophet, but in imitation of prophetic poverty and privation; nor even so as a servile imitator, for this he could not be, and in the rest of his life of privation followed no pattern but himself. Still meditation under the guidance of the prophets, the profound wrestling of a lonely life of prayer, must have been added to these acts of self-denial, and have formed the spiritual centre and goal of these external modes of self-deliverance.

But what then was really aimed at and compassed by this anchorite existence, this life of renunciation? The purely personal motive of John was the felt necessity, which sounded

* Fasting Matt. ix. 14; xi. 18. Food and clothing Matt. iii. 4 (cf. xi. 8). The honey of wild bees in the clefts of rocks or as an exudation from shrubs and trees of the wilderness (Manna) cf. Winer, A. Honig, Heuschrecken. The neighbourhood of Jericho rich in honey Jos. B. J. 4, 8, 3: *καὶ μελιττοτρόφος δὲ ἡ χώρα*. The locusts came from Arabia in numbers to Jericho. Permitted as food already in Lev. xi. 22 and, according to the Talmud, preferred by epicures to young pigeons; compared to crabs. The Gosp. of the Eb. put instead of ἀκρίδες or locusts (which as such and as animal food offended them): *μίλι ἄγριον, οὗ ἡ γεῦσις ἦν τοῦ μάννα, ὡς ἐγκρίς ἐν ἔλαιῳ* (=oil cake) Epiph. Haer. 30 § 13. The hairy garment (*sak*) at the same time a penitential garb vid. Lex. Still in use among the poorer classes and pilgrims, Furrer p. 27: upper garment of camel's or goat's hair. At the same time, doubtless, it is the garb of prophets and of Elijah cf. Isa. xx. 2. 2 Kings i. 8 (*ἄνθρωπος δασύς*), Zech. xiii. 14: *δέρις τριχίνῃ*; Hebr. xi. 37: *ἐρματα αργῆα*. The girdle (among the rich of linen, cotton, silk inlaid with gold) when of leather was like the girdle of hair (Isa. iii. 24) worn by the poor and by prophets, see 2 Kings i. 8: *ζώνην δερματ. περιζώσμενος* (Elijah). In the present day it is worn half a foot in breadth.

like a voice of God, to conquer for himself by means of a higher and weightier performance, a far other driving and striving, than that of the sacrificing and celebrating and yet indolent and slothful Israel, the grace of God and the dignity of man in His sight. This mode of meriting grace was with him no merely outward one, it demanded a heart without hypocrisy, without wayering, full of agony for sin, full of fervour for God, but (and herein he was still a genuine Jew) one that should prove its earnestness, its fulness and its strength, no otherwise than by its immediate embodiment in an outward deed, whose heroism, cutting deep into the flesh, should refute all doubt as to the pious intention: in the casting off of all the charms and at the same time of all the impurities of society and of culture; in damming up the sensual appetites to the mean of nature, nay, of hungry want; thus he thought simultaneously to do penance for the uncleanness which he marked within, and to cast down the barriers which sundered him from contact with God.* Still a merely personal motive was unknown to John. That he went into the wilderness not only to save his own soul to God, like the Essene, but also with the thought of saving his people, is guaranteed at the outset by the fact that he was a whole-hearted Jew, and then by the fact that he became the Baptist. Even his garb spoke for him: if in any way he had recourse to the mantle of prophecy, it is plain, we should suppose, that without feeling himself at first to be a prophet, yet as a disciple of the prophets he was willing to bear about within him the honour and the reproach of Israel, in the name of his people to despise hierarchs and Romans, by offerings of prayer and penitence upon undesecrated ground to win God's clemency for his people, and amid holy fastings in accordance with the belief of the time, to receive the gracious Revelation of God for all.

* These assumptions are based upon the fact of his subsequent stand against hypocrisy, his demand for repentance, which in the first instance after all he had himself performed, as well as on the general opinions of the age, cf. the Essenian *εγκράτεια* B. J. 2, 8, 2. Vol. I. p. 366. Also the *σκληραγωγία* of Jos. V. 2.

This Revelation of God he heard. Even before, we may presume, it had become humanly certain to him, that the time was bearing in its bosom the judgments of God. To the misery of Herodian rule had succeeded the equal tyranny of the Pagan yoke of slavery imposed by Rome; the experience of one generation sufficing to banish every happy dream. A census that sucked both blood and money, bringing in its train both old and new fangled taxes, which when only ten years in force (17 A.D.) had led to the exhaustion of the people, and a desperate appeal to Rome for their remission, in addition to these imposts provincial governors greedy of gold and reckless of right, like genuine Roman equestrians as they were, who strained their authority to the uttermost, and revelled in their plenitude of power; servilely copied by their officials and soldiers: there were heathen garrisons in the Holy City and by the Temple; there was playing fast and loose with the High Priesthood, and from time to time with all that was holy in this people's life; one thing after another.* Since the year

* The procuratorships (cf. besides L. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengesch. Roms von August bis zu den Antoninen* 1862, 192 ff.) as imperial administrations of finance for the purpose of raising all fiscal revenues, and no less in smaller provinces as independent administrative posts *cum potestate* were as a rule in the hands of the Knights, who appear elsewhere also as the men of finance and industry (bankers, wholesale dealers, farmers of taxes), and in this department of imperial offices (*procuratores Cæsaris*) found their Nobility, just as the senatorial rank did in the curule offices of the prætorship and consulate (*Tac. Agric. 4: quæ equestris nobilitas est.*) Their highest position indeed they held in Egypt where they were vice-roys. *Tac. H. 1, 11.* On the degeneracy of the knightly rank and the easy ways of admission to it (every tribune of a cohort and even every first centurion rose to it) cf. Friedländer *loc. cit.* In Palestine Coponius is already Knight *Jos. Ant. 18, 1, 1: τάγματος τῶν ἱππέων*: afterwards *Tac. Hist. 5, 9*, tells us of the *Emp. Claudius: Judæam provinciam equitibus Romanis aut libertis permisit.* This may serve also as supplement to Vol. I. pp. 255, 261. The taxes as regards their extent are not more definitely known. On the whole the Romans may have continued the system of Herod (cf. Vol. I. p. 243 f.). Along with the property (personal and land) tax (*κῆνσος* *Matt. xvii. 25; xxii. 17 ff.*) and the tolls (*Matt. ix. 9; xvii. 25*) the market tax was continued (*Ant. 17, 8, 4. 18, 4, 3*) until Vitellius in the year 36, and house tax until Agrippa about the year 42. (*19, 6, 3.*) Exhaustion *Tac. Ann. 2, 42.* However Jerusalem paid scarcely 1-12th of the taxes of the richer and larger Alexandria *B. J. 2, 16, 4.*

26 Pontius Pilate, immortalized by the Roman Historian Tacitus without a word of blame, rather with a hint of praise for his penal sentence against Jesus, and praised by Renan's playfully discursive pen as a good administrator, was the ruler of the land, which knew no compeer to him, except it were Gessius Florus, the diabolical author of the Jews' last struggle of despair. Pilate made a point of mocking and infringing the sacred customs of the Jews. He was not only, as one might say, without any knowledge of the people, he was not simply tyrannical and haughty, even towards Antipas and Herod's sons, and hot-headed besides; but he was naturally malicious and always lying in wait for an occasion of giving vent to the inward rancour of his heart, which boiled against a people that he did not understand, and that defied him, in venomous sallies of petty cunning. We have seen the instances; provocations without end; the treacherous hedgings in, assaults and slaughterings, among the defenceless people of Jerusalem. And so inveterate a tyrant was he that even there where he saw his blunder, and trembled before Tiberius, he was unable to recede, because he could not so far conquer himself as to suffer any curtailment, or do his subjects a good turn. If added to all this we are to reckon up the list of his vices, as catalogued by Philon his contemporary without exaggeration, his crimes of venality, his deeds of violence, his plunderings, outrages, threats, a long series of sanguinary and unjust condemnations, cruelties transcending what had ever been thought of or reached, we may sound the misery of a nation, which was fain to cry to King Herod as a benefactor, because it was tormented and trodden by the Roman like a helpless worm, and nowhere saw an end to the weird torture which always threatened it anew from some unlooked-for side.* That was the time, as John, unlike Jesus, beheld it at close quarters.

* Cf. Vol. I. 261, 300 f. Luke xiii. 1, xxiii. 12. Uncommonly instructive at the same time is Philo Leg. 1033 f. The catalogue: τὰς δωροδοκίας, τὰς ὑβρεις, τὰς ἀρπαγὰς, τὰς αἰκίας, τὰς ἐπηρείας, τοὺς ἀκρίτους καὶ ἐπαλλήλους φόνους,

In addition there were High Priests from among the cold unbelieving Sadducees, just now a Caiaphas whom the people hated, and whom Pilate loved, or at least continually bore with; Pharisees and Scribes, who held their peace at sight of a shameful yoke, which they themselves had wished for and out of a shrewd expediency found tolerable. Last of all a people that, in common with its spiritual leaders, sweetened the present and gilded the future by the lazy fancy of a well-fed piety.* Amid such pictures of the age John believed in a different way to his contemporaries in the nearness of God, namely in divine judgments, which before all things must needs cleanse the foggy airs of Israel by means of lightning and thunder.† The God of Israel had never hidden himself thus for centuries, nor taken so calmly the scorn of the heathen, the need and the sin of his people: he must come then to the rescue of his honour. Had not already the prophetic book of Daniel announced but a short duration for the time of the iron Gentiles, the Romans?‡ Now it had lasted for a generation. But had not also in these latter times the curse of the heathenizing house of Idumea, the fall of Antipater, Phasael, Herod, Archelaos, and such numerous offshoots of the condemned family, betokened the advance of God's wrath and vengeance? Had not, but now, a single vigorous revulsion of sentiment on the part of the people of Jerusalem against Pilate and his heathenish consecration of shields, revealed the un-

την ἀνήνυτον καὶ ἀργαλειωτάτην ὥμότητα. — ἐγκότως ἔχων καὶ βαρύμηνις ἄνθρωπος. — μὴ βουλόμενός τι τῶν πρὸς ἡδονὴν τοῖς ὑπηκόοις ἐργάσασθαι. With this Renan p. 401 f. But already Ewald p. 36 is far too favourable to him because of the water supply, a useful measure desired it is said by the Sanhedrim and Priests.

* Cf. the significant word of Tac. Hist. 5, 10; *duravit tamen patientia Judacis usque ad Gessium Florum procuratorem*. Caiaphas, still High Priest under Valerius Gratus, remained so through the whole of Pilate's Procuratorship: cf. Vol. I. p. 261. That he was hated follows at once from his Sadducæism, and is hinted Joseph. Ant. 18, 4, 3.

† That John believed primarily not in a gracious but in an avenging God of Israel is shown in Matt. iii. 2 ff. 7 ff.

‡ Dan. vii. 25; xii. 7. Cf. Jos. Ant. 10, 11, 7.

weaponed tyrant in all his poverty and nakedness?*

The judgments of God, of which the prophets had written, were destined, after a fresh period of endurance and abuse, to descend upon the foes of Israel, and on Israel's self.

What John in Jerusalem might have boded, that grew for him to a certainty in the wilderness. To begin with, the wilderness cleared his vision from anxiously counting and weighing the foeman's might, and the infinite weakness of Israel; by which, after all, every great resolve was stifled; so that he now could gaze on the boundless majesty of God, asserting itself without in Nature, within in his own conscience. To the great Ruler of the heavens Israel had so often appealed in the midst of desperate surroundings; here in the wilderness of Judah the appeal came still easier, where to the soaring flight of ideal thoughts the free gales offered no impediment, and the mighty reality of God smiled above the sandgrain of human existences and powers. But John found still more ground for belief. The judgments of God mentioned in the Prophets ever covered both curse and blessing, death and resurrection; but at this time all tokens declared for the necessity of God's only smiting and destroying Jews and Heathens alike. Thus he was forced to give up the belief in God's nearness, on the strength of the Oracles, which could not have found their fulfilment in such an Israel as this, and as himself a true Israelite for the people's sake, whom he could not bear to see bleed to death in a mere judgment of God's wrath. Still he believed and learned in the wilderness to believe with boundless boldness. He had by dint of prayer, of penitence, of renunciation, lost in the desert the world, his sin, his pain, and found peace, repose, grace, and sunshine from on high; and lo! the thought gleamed upon him; it grew to a certainty; first he in Israel's place, then Israel in his place, an Israel full of action, resolve, conversion, repentance—a repentance possible, nay easy, and always in Israel's history rich in streams of

* The story of the shields after the year 31, Vol. I. p. 302.

blessing ; and the judgments of God were now to part in mid air, and pour down as punishment for the enemy, but as help for the people of God. Then found he the call of God in his soul (and it was the call of God) : Go hence and preach to the people " judgment, but mercy for the penitent."*

2.—THE APPEARANCE OF THE BAPTIST IN THE WILDERNESS.

a. THE PREACHER IN THE WILDERNESS.

The thought conceived by John of bringing in an era of salvation for the people by means of a new spiritual uplifting of Israel, was nothing more nor less than a fresh prophetic enterprize undertaken in the spirit of those men of old, who, moved by their religion and their God, had thrown down before the Kings of the South and the North, even the rulers of Syria and Assyria, the entire population of their time, the gauntlet of their Yes and No, and with this Yes and No had set in motion the Nation, the thrones, and the surrounding peoples. But if brought into closer connexion with the character of these later periods, we must look upon his undertaking as in a certain sense nothing else than the last solemn affirmation, and at the same time also the boldest and most penetrating realisation of the mighty tendencies which the sacred community had prescribed for itself since the times of the Exile, and under stress of a noble enthusiasm had carried out in many forms, and with many a fresh forward start, though only in fragmentary fashion. That which, from the days of Ezra down to those of the Pharisees and Scribes of Jesus' time, had cease-

* Luke iii. 2: ἐγένετο ῥῆμα Θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννῃν. Virtually also Matt. iii. 3. Jesus too recognises his divine mission Matt. xxi. 25. Repentance the way to the Messiah's kingdom cf. Joel ii. 12. Philo, Vol. I. 279, 316 . . . Besides Sanhedr. f. 97: si Israelitæ pœnitentiam agunt, tunc per Goëlem liberantur. Hieros. Taan. f. 64 (cf. Lightf. 262) : what delays the coming of the Messiah? Ans. Conversion. Turn ye, come (Isa. xxi. 12). Rabbi Acha : if Israel would repent only one day, the Son of David would come forthwith. Rabbi Levi : if Israel would observe only one Sabbath according to the ordinance, forthwith would the Son of David come. Bab. Sanh. f. 97 : Rab says : all the stages are passed, and all depends solely on repentance and good works. Oehler Messiah, p. 436.

lessly occupied the best minds in Israel; viz. the realization of a perfect human piety and its spread through the whole mass of the people as the one condition, yes, the one creative power that could bring about a new period of heavenly glory for Israel, this, after Pharisaic attempts at building up as fruitless as they were prolonged, and even sinking at last, as it were, into a nodding somnolence, was now undertaken by John in a new and startlingly vigorous manner. Its startling power lay most of all in its grand reversal of perspectives, such as was only possible to an altogether heroic and dauntless spirit of religious faith, in its proclamation of the approaching deed of God, which should anticipate the deed of men, independent of their yea or nay, and their comfortably prudent preparation; but at the same time also in the sudden forcing on his hearers of the question which would brook no delay but must be answered thoroughly and fundamentally at once, how men were to escape in the judgment of God. With this tempestuous importunity for a Yes or a No, a round full answer towards God, the content of John's requirements and even the manner of his entrance on the scene, stood in something more than a mere accidental connexion. There all was sharp and cutting, imperious earnest about final questions, unsparing overthrow of all fictitious shams in individual as in national life. There were no theories of the Law, no new good works, and no belief in the old, but simply and solely a prophetic clutch at men's consciences, a mighty accusation, a crushing summons to contrite repentance and speedy sanctification. There was no time, no inclination for discussion with spiritual authorities; but only for a downright and straightforward appeal to the people in its living entirety. Not even in Jerusalem did he show himself, but on ground that was more than merely safe, that was fresh and undesecrated, yes, God's own ground in the wilderness, where in Moses' day He had showed forth his glory, smitten and trained the people, steeled them and purified them for their entry into the Holy Land; where the

prophets had mysteriously displayed the ways and the wonders of God, where afterwards incompetent leaders without a call from heaven until after the destruction of Jerusalem consoled and cheated the people with revelations of God's power and grace; there must the sacred community arise.* Add to the scene the picture of the man, his garb, his word of thunder, the waste and Jordan's stream: a bolt had fallen in Israel, a revolution began that had not elsewhere its like; of which the hour before had never dreamt.

If once more, before he steps forth, crying and baptizing, we take a glance at this marvellous man, in order to penetrate into the secrets of his inmost consciousness in regard to his mission, we should be disappointed by the total silence in which he has enshrouded his person, if it were not that it spoke of itself with eloquence enough. John, has no time, no right, no obligation to speak about himself, because a mighty time and a mighty task is making its own entry among men, and issues a free warrant to any who will but be the mouthpiece of the cause. Hence not a word about divine revelation and inspiration, about voices and visions, or prophetic call. It belongs to the greatness of John, that he, the strong man of God, is the lowliest of all the prophets. Of course, without the consciousness of a divine mission, especially at such a time, and in such a manner he would never have come forward as he did, and the decision of his mode of address, his comparison of himself with Him who should come after him, his very attire, must have implied this mission in the people's eyes. But not only did he recognize the limitations of the task assigned to him, assured that his own person could not bring salvation,

* The wilderness the place of humiliation, and proofs of divine power, Deut. viii. 2 ff. Isa. xlviii. 21; li. 10. Purification and sanctification of the people at Sinai by washing Ex. ix. 10, in the plain of Jericho by circumcision Joshua v. 1 ff. cf. iv. 13. Enlivening of the wilderness Isa. xxxii. 15; xxxv. 1 f.; xlv. 3 ff. Sacred way in the wilderness xxxv. 8; xl. 3; xli. 18; xliii. 19. Moreover the place of fresh revelations for later prophets and pseudoprophets Matt. xxiv. 26. Acts v. 36; xxi. 38. Jos. Ant. 20, 5, 1. 8, 6. B. J. 6, 6, 3. 7, 11, 1.

but even for this limited work he was compelled in God's name to suppress both before others and himself the title of prophet. When the people sought to surmise his mission, holding him a prophet, this of itself is a proof of his reserve. When Jesus later on made enigmatical mention of Elias to his disciples, this is a token that he did not so designate himself, that he had not even forcibly implied it by his words or by his guise. Even the fourth Gospel took notice of this silence of the Baptist concerning himself, by a significant representation, attributing to him in presence of an embassy from Jerusalem, anxious to sound him, a round denial of all lofty titles: "I am no Messiah, no Elias, I am not that Prophet." Only it made him say too much after all, by reporting him as calling himself the forerunner in the words of a well-known passage of Isaiah, which the older Gospels freely apply to him on their own account, while the fourth Gospel puts it directly in his mouth, thus making him style himself in some sort Elias after all, by virtue of popular tradition; and representing him as having somewhat later appealed downright to the voice of a divine revelation, on which the older Gospels are likewise silent. The utter humility of the man, which we thus remark, contrasts all the more powerfully with the mighty work, which he actually took upon his shoulders.

As a matter of fact he determined immediately to make way for the Kingdom of God; as a matter of fact therefore he entered on the vocation, which the Old Testament, and the whole belief of the time, reserved for the hero prophet, the conqueror of idols and of kings, Elijah the Tishbite, who immediately before the appearance of the Kingdom of God was to come from heaven to make Israel ready for the same. It was the might of religion itself, of the belief in God and in God's people, which compelled John, in view of the signs of the times, to take in hand the task of an Elias, who failed to appear in the body; and again it was the might of religion, the consciousness that God did everything, and man nothing, that hindered him in spite of the work of Elias, from daring

even to be a prophet. Here, as nowhere else, appears the pure and lofty power of God in history, which lays hold of a man as an instrument, when the feeblest and lowliest in Israel did not shrink from the call to be an Elias, though it transcended the measure of humanity; and yet again in the height of this calling never lost the consciousness of his own nothingness.*

From the wilderness of Judah, John stepped forth to the banks of the Jordan. Two Gospels apparently represent him as preaching in the wilderness itself, viz. Matthew and Mark; but their motive is merely to show how the prophecy of Isaiah, concerning a preacher in the wilderness, the meaning of which, however, is quite different, was fulfilled in John; and, plainly enough, they themselves place the Baptist at the Jordan, where he is most clearly located by the third Gospel, which makes John come out of the wilderness into all the district round Jordan. In the wider sense of the word, doubtless, even the Jordan district was, as we shall see, waste and wild.† The region of the Jordan which he entered was at all events to begin with no other than that on its hither side, namely, that of Judæa, no other, indeed, than that somewhere about Jericho, the same where of old Joshua had sanctified Israel by circumcision on their entrance into the country.‡ For northward from Jericho the wilderness of Judæa in any case is at an end, and a few hours' journey south-east from Jericho the Jordan is merged in the Dead Sea. This situation is moreover postulated by the direction of John's activity towards Jerusalem, and the account we have in the first line of the streaming of Jerusalem's and Judæa's inhabitants to the baptism on the banks of the Jordan.

* Expectation of Elias cf. Mal. iv. 5. Sirach xlviii. 10. Matt. xi. 14; xvi. 14; xvii. 3. 10. Rev. xi. 3-6. Rabbinical passages in Lightf. 339 f. Bertholdt p. 58, 63 ff. Acc. to a later custom at circumcisions a chair was placed for Elias as witness, and the cry "Elias come soon!" was raised. Herzog. A. Proselyten. Cf. also the question concerning the Messiah below.

† Matt. iii. 1-6. Mark i. 4-5. Luke iii. 2-3. John i. 23. The prophetic passage Isa. xl. 3. The wilderness is here the wasted Holy Land of the time of the Exile (cf. xxxv. 1). Wilderness is the downright designation of this district of the Jordan not only by Josephus, but also by Jesus Matt. xi. 7. ‡ Joshua v. 1 ff.

To this district also the spot where Jesus was baptized, and the scene of his retirement to the wilderness, is assigned by comparatively ancient tradition, namely, to some place nearly opposite to Jericho, which is not itself upon the Jordan, in the neighbourhood of the Monastery of St. John now lying in ruins; though with the qualification that the Greek and Roman pilgrims, who are accustomed on Easter Monday to dip themselves in the Holy Water, seek the veritable scene of the Baptist's ministrations, (each party having a spot of its own) more than a league away.* This view, that it was the lower Jordan on its hither side, is opposed less by the third Gospel which places the ministry of John quite vaguely in the whole district of Jordan, and yet itself too favours the neighbourhood of the desert of Judæa on the south-west of the Jordan, than it is by the fourth Gospel.† This, like Luke knows of a variety of successive scenes of the Baptism, but the starting point of the Baptist it essentially seeks on the further easterly bank in Peræa, and assigns his entire ministry to the middle rather than to the lower part of the Jordan's course. For to begin with John is in Bethany of Peræa, the existence of which, however, is utterly unproved, and which the topographically well-informed Origen would fain have changed in defiance of all ancient MSS. into the Bethabara (Fordhouse) with which he *was* acquainted; and from this region of Peræa Jesus required three full days for the journey to Judæa and Bethany by Jerusalem.‡ In this more northerly tract the Baptist appears later on again in this Gospel, only on this side the river, for he is at Ænon by Salim, which (not to speak of some obscure spots in Southern Judæa) we can only prove with Eusebius and Jerome to be situate to the north about three hours' journey above Scythopolis on the southernmost border of Galilee, 26 to 27 hours'

* Robinson 2, 497. Arnold, A. Bethabara in Herzog.

† Luke iii. 3 (cf. i. 80). John i. 28; iii. 23, 26; x. 40; xi. 1-17.

‡ Cf. John i. 28 and Tischendorf. Origen himself confesses that *σχεδὸν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις* the reading is *Βηθανία*. On the above calculation (acc. to John x. 40 ff.) cf. Meyer Comm. on John 4th n, on i, 28.

journey from Jerusalem.* Plainly we have here different traditions, of which the later, namely, the Johannine must be explained either as a legend of the more recent Christian community of Pella in Peræa, east of Scythopolis ; or what is perhaps more likely, from the inclination of the writer to bring the Baptist as well as Jesus into connexion with the boundaries of Samaria. Now for the hypothesis of northern Peræa there was, indeed, scarcely any historical justification. On the other hand, Peræa generally, *i.e.*, the country beyond Jordan could make good its claim historically so far as the fact is concerned, that John the Baptist, was afterwards demonstrably in Peræa (in the south of it, indeed) ; namely, when he was put in prison.

As to which is the correct tradition these remarks suffice to decide : the Synoptic account is the older, is thrice vouched for, and even confirmed by Josephus : nor could John as a native of Judæa have easily carried his operations into the far north, nor would he have begun with the little regarded Peræa, and had he done so, it would not have been first the Jerusalemites and lastly the Galilæans, but first the Galilæans, and lastly the Jerusalemites that would come to him.† Even the fourth Gospel itself, by representing at the very outset an embassy from Jerusalem as appearing in the presence of the Baptist, and by seemingly reckoning a journey of three days

* John iii. 23. On Aenon and Salim (Salem) cf. Eus. Hier. onom. under both words. Jer. Ep. 73. (ruins of Salim, Salumias, with large remains of Melchizedech's Palace !). Again Winer and Herzog. The places of like name in Josh. xv. 32 (cf. Sept.) and xv. 61 (Sept.), belonging to Judah, do not match. For Schilchim in the first passage is in spite of Sept. not Salim and in the second, Aenon (without Salim) in the wilderness of Judah is only the reading of Sept. Besides at this spot one might speak indeed of the Dead Sea, but not of the Jordan : and that obscure Salim could not possibly elucidate the obscure Aenon (John iii. 23). According to Eus. Hier. Salim is 8 miles south of Scythopolis in the plain of Jordan (in campo). Scyth. or Bethshean in Issachar 600 stades=30 leagues from Jerusalem, 2 Macc. xii. 29. Ewald p. 166 also puts Aenon in Samaria, Renan p. 101 is doubtful.

† Matt. iii. 5, 13 ; xxi. 32. Also Jos. Ant. 18, 5, 2 : he distinguishes the hearers as Jews and others.

between John's place of abode and Cana of Galilee, has unintentionally supported the tradition of the other Evangelists.*

Two hours eastward from the Jericho of to-day, the miserable dirty village of Eriha, according to Josephus as much as three hours' journey from the ancient town of Jericho, from eight to nine hours from Jerusalem, the River of Israel majestically flows.†

It has here accomplished the greater portion of its pilgrimage. Springing in several tributary streams out of the northern home of Jesus, near Cæsarea Philippi, whence of old the Lord undertook the fateful journey to Jerusalem, and rising as regards its principal stream somewhat higher up among the mountains of Lebanon, then cutting through the little pear-shaped Lake of Merom, and soon afterwards the glorious Lake of Gennesaret, the region of the ministry of Jesus; from here to Jericho it has accomplished by countless meanderings a distance equal to thirty hours' journey in a straight line. It streams with torrent speed, and has in this district a breadth of from 90 to 100 feet, a variable depth of from 3 to 7 feet, along with a few shallow fords (*e.g.* the ford of El Helu to the south-east of Jericho); while, however, at the time of the spring floods it is certain death to attempt to cross it on foot.‡ The water is thick and yellowish from the loamy soil over which it passes, moderately cool and refreshing, and not without peril from its rapid zigzag current. The effect is wildly romantic: the prophets of old praised the "fair attire of Jordan." The bank, from two to three feet high, and here and there steep, is thickly covered with trees

* i. 19. ii. 1.

† Distance of Jericho from Jordan 60, from Jerusalem 150 stades. Jos. B. J. 4, 8, 3. Furrer reckons from Jerusalem to Jericho $6\frac{1}{2}$ leagues; thence to Jordan 1 league, 2 miles.

‡ Cf. the representations Jos. B. J. 3, 10, 7. 4, 7, 5. 4, 8, 2 ff. In 7, 5: *γραφὴν ὑπ' ὀμβρῶν ἄβατον ἦν*. Hence the death of countless numbers in the waves in the neighbourhood of Jericho under Vespasian. Ib. Cf. also Josh. iii. 15. 1 Chron. xii. 15. Tac. Hist. 5, 6: *idem* (Libanus) *amnem Jordanem alit funditque, nec Jordanes pelago accipitur, sed unum atque alterum lacum integer perfluit, tertio retinetur*. Robinson 2, 498 ff.

and undergrowth, behind which once the lion lurked. Here at one time there stood flourishing and fruitful palm-trees, now ever-green tamarisks, acacias, willows, and oleanders are seen ; but the chief growth is an abundance of marshy reed.*

The valley is only a short mile broad, barren already on its borders ; beyond, to a height of from fifty to sixty feet, rises a plain three or four leagues in breadth, flanked on both sides by steep, bare, chalk hills, showing great sameness of outline ; to the west the hills of Judah, 1000 to 1200 feet high ; eastward the mountain ranges of Peræa, height from 2000 to 5000 feet. This plain is the once famous plain of Jordan, the circle of the Jordan, where Sodom flourished, and disappeared beneath the volcanic wrath of God ; now, under the name of El-Ghor, as formerly during the historical period of Israel, a great sandy, barren, boundless desert, and, in summer especially, from the low situation of this volcanic depression, and from the nearness of Arabia, altogether arid, burning hot, and unhealthy ; a perfect contrast, on the one hand, to the green paradise of the west, the "heavenly land" of Jericho, city of roses and of palms, and on the other to the thin strip of vegetation which the river waters to the east, and which but a few steps from its banks seems extinguished and cut off as in a dream.†

Into this awful grandeur of nature, among these stones and rocks, to the shores of this rushing river, amid the quivering reeds upon its banks, did the noble Judæan (as Josephus calls him) the one man of Israel, whom, according to a saying of Jesus,

* The Palms B. J. 4, 8, 2. Jordan's "fair attire" Jer. xii. 5. ; xlix. 19 ; 1. 44. Zech. xi. 3.

† Kikkar Hajjarden, ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, in Josephus τὸ μέγα πεδίον, whose length he puts at 230 stades, the breadth 120 (B. J. 4, 8, 2). District of Jericho θείον χωρίον B. J. 4, 8, 3 cf. 1, 6, 6. 18, 5. Ant. 5, 4, 1. The heat and drought in the Ghor B. J. 4, 8, 2. The regions between Jerusalem and Jericho and between Jericho and Jordan are represented as vast wildernesses 4, 8, 3 : ἔρημον ὁμοίως καὶ ἄκαρπον, 3, 10, 7 : the Jordan goes into the Dead Sea πολλὴν ἀναμετρούμενος ἔρημίαν. For the rest cf. the modern descriptions of travel, Burckhardt, Robinson, Sepp, Furrer ; also Winer and Arnold A. Jordan.

none could call "a reed," summon his panic-stricken people.* How the movement began we know not. John can hardly have taken up his parable, after being consulted as an illustrious hermit, like Banus; according to the Gospels he spake as one who came fresh from his concealment to address himself to the dwellers by the Jordan, and from small beginnings there gradually grew an assemblage of the people, to which all Israel sent its representatives.

Following the scanty delineations furnished by our Gospels, we are led to think of the prophet himself, wont to stand in his hairy garment, a mighty figure with outstretched arms, as though to cast down and point to heaven, and even in his attitude we see the man, the preacher of righteous rebuke, the herald of a hastening judgment; yet may we not overlook the fact, that ancient traditions portray him as in a sitting posture, in order to indicate a restful assurance, and a command over men's minds, such as actually came to light in his greater successor.†

In view of the nearness of God's day of reckoning, John called aloud, as only Joel the Prophet of old, to repentance: "Change your minds, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." This call of his has the ancient testimony not only of the first Gospel, but also of the speeches of Jesus concerning John, yes, of the call of Jesus himself, who at the entrance on his career, repeated the Baptist. The speeches of Jesus prove at the same time clearly enough, that the call of Jesus was not, as some in modern times believe, artificially perhaps transferred by the first Gospel to John, which besides, as lessening the novelty of the appearance of Jesus, would be highly improbable; but that as an historical fact the call of the Jewish prophet was taken up by him afresh as a sign of the connexion

* Matt. xi. 7. Jos. Ant. 18, 5, 2: ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα, &c.

† Justin. M. Tryph. 49. 88: καθεζόμενος; cf. Volkmar, Ursp. Ev. p. 156. On Jesus cf. Matt. xiii. 2.

between them.* Mark and Luke have at the outset only mentioned the Baptist's call to repentance, without excluding the proclamation of the kingdom, since after all they both point to the mighty future which the Forerunner had inaugurated.† In order to work repentance, John brought out of this notion of the kingdom of heaven, already present in Israel, though by him drawn nearer and anew defined, by Jesus consummated — its cutting, wounding, and killing asperities into prominent relief; leaving the prospect of divine blessing like a faint melodious undertone, to wake a hope in sensitive hearts which might rise superior to their self-despair.‡ With genuine desert-pictures, and in mighty desert-style, he, according to Matthew, addressed the Pharisees and Sadducees, the hierarchs, new and old; according to the less likely report of Luke, the entire people, who, after all, were in the main really eager for salvation,—with the words, “Ye brood of vipers, who hath assured you that ye should escape the wrathful judgment that is to come. Bring therefore fruits worthy of repentance, and think not to say within yourselves: for our Father we have Abraham; for I say unto you God can, out of these stones, raise up children unto Abraham. But already the axe is lying at the root of the trees: every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit, shall be hewn down and cast into the fire.”§

* Cf. on Hofmann, Holtzmann, Hilgenfeld, Strauss, Weisse, my *Gesch. Christus* 3rd Ed. p. 24. Along with Matt. iii. stand xi. 10-12; xxi. 28-32, as a refutation, for they show that John must have raised the cry at once of repentance and the kingdom. Jesus' cry Matt. iv. 17. † Mark i. 4-8. Luke iii. 3, 7 ff.

‡ The idea of the kingdom, Vol. I. p. 315, and Jesus' Doctrine (Vol. III.)

§ Matt. iii. 7-10. Such speeches must have been addressed in pretty much the same manner as well to the people as the hierarchs: hence the difference of the writers, of whom Matthew is eager to distinguish between the hierarchs and the believing people, while Luke is eager to show the sin of all Israel. Besides Luke has here the intention of obtaining for the various warnings and promises of the Baptist the audience of a single set of persons. But in any case the Baptist rather addressed the hierarchs than the whole people simply as a generation of vipers. It was just the people that believed in him, Matt. xxi. 32. I am inclined to think (the question is full of interest) that Luke gave this turn to the speech

Here, before all, it is important to notice, how thoroughly moral was his conception of repentance. Doubtless along with the moral requirements was united closely enough the outward ascetic act of baptism in water, a sign that John still stood in the midst of his age ; but yet the latter never swallowed up the former, a sign again that he had taken a great step beyond his time. The repentance which he required, was before all according to the very meaning of the Greek word a change of mind ; and he understood thereby, in conformity to the Old Testament itself, two things, sorrow for sin, and actual amendment. Both are indicated in equal measure by the Gospels, and by Josephus ; the former speak of an anxious flying from wrath, an effort to obtain forgiveness of sins, and in the same immediate context of the requirement of moral fruits, which in their goodness stand upon the spiritual height of the repentant mind ; the latter is aware of a striving after purification, consisting not so much in the relinquishment of special sins, as in the restoration to a new life.* Therefore to baptism itself belongs a confession of sins, a renunciation of all self-righteousness, whether as an heirloom of outward Abrahamitic birth and Israelitish circumcision, or the acquisition of outward Pharisaic righteousness ; finally the obligation to a new righteousness before God and man, especially in fulfilment of the most urgent duties towards neighbours. This demand for a new moral life and character Josephus brings out into strong relief as contrasted with cheap desires for forgiveness, indeed as that which must always be

himself (not his authority, which obviously does not wish to break with Judaism). The pictorial language of John is quite freshly borrowed from the wilderness. Vipers (cf. Wiener, Art. Schlange and Jericho), stones, trees &c.

* Matt. iii. 7 : φυγεῖν ἀπ' ὀργῆς. xxi. 33 : μεταμέλεισθαι. Mark i. 4, Luke iii. 3 : εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Matt. iii. 8 : καρπὸν ἄξιον τῆς μετανοίας. Jos. Ant. 18, 5, 2 : κτείνει τοῦτον Ἡρώδης, ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους κελεύοντα ἀρετὴν ἐπασκοῦντας καὶ τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβεῖα χρωμένους βαπτισμῷ συνίναι. οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τὴν βάπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῷ φανείσθαι, μὴ ἐπὶ τινων ἁμαρτιῶν παραιτήσῃ χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἁγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνῃ προεκεκαθάρμίνης.

brought already in principle, as the indispensable condition for outward baptism; while according to the Gospels it rather appears as the indispensable consequence. In the practice of virtue, so Josephus makes the Baptist speak, and in the observance of justice towards each other and of piety towards God, shall the Jews come together for baptism; for so even the bodily baptism will seem agreeable unto God, if in truth the soul as well has first been thoroughly purged by righteousness.*

Doubtless however this spiritual repentance took shape and found immediate expression in the external ceremony of dipping in the Jordan. The plunging of the person in the water was the altogether new and characteristic form of this repentance. Hence it was called a baptism of repentance or a baptism to repentance, *i.e.*, an immersion, which has its meaning, essence and aim in repentance.† If we ask, what this form was supposed to contribute to the thing signified, how it was to represent or to accomplish the latter, the answer is, the symbolism or language of signs in this act, which after all was but simple and of single occurrence, subservient and subordinate, as Josephus especially insists, a mere accompaniment of a spiritual deed—is at once apparent, especially on oriental ground, where there is a fondness for pictorial portraiture of ideas. Even according to Old Testament similes washing signified moral purification, whether by God, or by men themselves.‡ With John it meant essentially the latter, not the former, for baptism is altogether a deed in the first instance of the people,

* This detailment by Jos. loc. cit. corresponds in the main to the moral precepts, Luke iii. 10 ff. and to Matt. iii. 15. xxi. 32. Only the Pharisee desires no forgiveness.

† *βαπτίζω, βάπτισις* (Jos.), *βάπτισμα* (Ev.) freq. from *βάπτω*, to dip, to dip under, cf. Matt. xxvi. 23. Mark vii. 4. Heb. ix. 10. *βάπτ. μετανόιας*, Mark i. 4. Luke iii. 3. Acts xiii. 37. *β. εἰς μεταν.* Matt. iii. 11. The first (Mark, Luke) means not baptism which binds to repentance (Meyer, Winer, § 30), the two together are immediately conjoined, even in Matt. iii. 8, baptism and repentance go together, and the final goal of the baptism Mark and Luke have afterwards expressed by *εἰς ἀφ.* It is the genitive of dependence and belonging as in *δικαίωσις ζωῆς* (justification which consists in life), *ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος* (purification, consisting in blood).

doubtless hallowed by the will of God, and crowned with prospective reward; it is an act of repentance, and an act unto repentance, with Josephus at the same time a sign of covenant among men, and the forgiveness of sins which lies in prospect, *that* appears, as was already perceived in the early Church, not as an immediate bestowal, but as something which was only to be given or denied after the baptism of repentance, by him who should come to judge and to punish.* Only it may be granted, the Evangelists Mark and Luke, with their later Christian view of baptism, and even at the outset the mass of the populace, with their twofold faith in the prophet and in magical external purifications, may not have distinguished so precisely between a bestowal by John and one by the Messiah who was afterwards to come.†

Nevertheless for John water is no *bare sign* of repentance, but something more than a sign. Inasmuch as the East is fond of clothing the spiritual in a sensuous garb, it has no power from the first of sharply sundering the two, and the sensuous itself is raised to the rank of a power and a force. Inasmuch as Judaism, inasmuch as John, practised ablutions, a belief grew up in the actual value of such ablution. The purity of the body obtained by water consummated the purity of man's being, and might often enough be accounted as the main point in itself. Even according to the Gospels John attributed at any rate some value to water, "I baptize you with water:" according to Josephus the water used by John was neither more nor less than the supplement to the spiritual purification,—the purification of the body, and as such well pleasing to God, as soon as

* Cf. Isa. xvi. 1 (man). Isa. xlv. 3. Mic. vii. 19. Ez. xxxvi. 25. Zech. xiii. 1 (God.)

† The former is clear from Matt. iii. 10, 11. Luke iii. 16, 17. The Gospel account, Luke iii. 3. Mark i. 4. Cf. G. of Heb. ap. Hier. adv. Pel. 3, 1: baptizat in remissionem peccatorum. Here is plainly already the later idea of the Apostolic Church (baptism with immediate forgiveness of sins), cf. Acts ii. 38. 1 Cor. vi. 11 imported. From the early Church cf. the judgments cited by Tert. d. bapt. 10 f. Aug. d. bapt. 5, 10. Steitz. A. Taufe in Herzog's Enc. XV., 466.

the purification of the soul had preceded it.* We have no ground at all for doubting the correctness of these statements, which quite suit the ascetic principles of John in other respects, especially as Josephus is visibly concerned rather to diminish than to exaggerate the estimate of water formed by John; in spite of all the polemic against magical purifications which he ascribes to him, and in spite of all the emphasis he lays upon the essentially spiritual purification, there is always left nevertheless to the water a positive function, force and energy. Here most of all we have an echo of the Judaism and perhaps too of the hermit-like practice of the Baptist. With masterly grasp and fine intelligence of the great and universally fundamental question of his age, he elsewhere erased from his requirements those outward purifications which his individual religious life could not dispense with; demanded only motive and morality, without, it is true, any deeper treatment of the questions of heart and conscience, and therefore without any bleeding need of reconciliation, but still with correct delineation of the genuine moral ground of religion: in this one point he was and remained a thorough Oriental, that he attributed to the material act itself, especially to its performance in the anciently hallowed and healing stream of Jordan; to the Levitical purification of the body, though in the most ideal and spiritualized form of an act involving a principle and done once for all—a certain religious worth, a share in the performance of the righteousness pleasing to God.† This worth of baptism as a sign and for the sake of the thing signified crowned in his conception the purport of the act of baptism, so as to make it a grand visible national means of union and covenant, concern-

* *ἀγγελία σώματος*—οὕτω ἀποδεκτὴν τὴν βάπτισιν, see the passage above. Moreover Banus, Vit. 2: *Ψυχρῷ ὕδατι τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν νύκτα πολλάκις λουόμενος πρὸς ἀγγελίαν*. Essenes, B. J., 2, 8, 7: *καθαρότερα τὰ πρὸς ἀγν. ὕδατα*. Such Jewish *ἀγγελία* appears negatived, or at least qualified in value in the Christian Baptism. 1 Pet. iii. 21: *οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόψεις ρύπον*. Heb. ix. 10: *δικαιώματα σαρκός*.

† Cf. 2 Kings v. 10. 14.

ing which Josephus alone gives us that express information for which we may so well be grateful.*

It was meant in a certain sense to be neither more nor less than the realization of a national circumcision, the sign and seal of a new and energetically undertaken service of righteousness for the godly, transcending all mere hereditary privileges, among which circumcision itself was reckoned; it was the sign and inscription of a new and mighty union, far other, because far wider than the narrow orders of the Pharisees and Essenes with their insignia; the mark of a nation hallowed, in the "remnant" of its best members, and perhaps, beyond expectation, in its grand entirety.†

Wholly new as were these ordinances of John in form and meaning, yet they stood in close connexion with other performances of ancient and modern piety. To go back to Indian affinities, which refuse to be restored, with Renan and now with Hilgenfeld as well, whether in the case of the Essenes, or in the case of John, is trouble spent in vain.‡ Washings of the body, the clothes, regular baths in the "living water" of fountains and of streams, were plentifully enough, with right and reason in the sultry East—provided for, as early as the Mosaic legislation, with its questions about clean and unclean: and the efforts after purification among the Pharisees and Essenes, as we saw, far transcended these prescriptions.§ In those questions the Old Testament in its day made no distinction between the bodily and the spiritual, police regulation and religion: so it came to pass, that even for essentially religious acts, as for prayers and offerings, and that even apart from all notorious pollutions of the body,—purifications, washings, and bathings were in use:

* βαπτισμῷ συνίναί = assemble to baptism, or through baptism. Cf. Strauss, p. 188 f.

† Cf. the passage above, p. 238. The "remnant" of the prophets (Isa. x. 21) is evidently floating before John in the first resort. (Matt. iii. 10 ff.)

‡ Renan, p. 95 f. Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift, 1866, IV. 1867, I.

§ Cf. Lev. xiv. 8 f. xv. 5, 13, 18. xvii. 16. xxii. 6, and elsewhere. Living water, majim chajim, πηγαῖα ὕδατα, Lev. xv. 13. Jos. Ant. 3, 11, 1.

where, in some cases, the pure hallowed the impure, Moses the Levites, Samuel Jesse and his sons, before the sacrifice was offered.* This mode of regarding the matter, which would have every approach to God hallowed on principle both by intention and ablution, is of itself fruitful explanation of the baptismal consecration with which John ushers in the mighty change in the relationship between God and man. But specially influential in their bearing upon the fresh procedure of John are two Old Testament facts. In the first place, Moses, in conformity with God's behest immediately before the grand revelations on Sinai, had consecrated the whole people in the wilderness by washings, which the later Rabbiniism ranked as a second covenant-sign along with circumcision as ordained by Moses and performed by Joshua upon thousands at the entering into the Holy Land by the Jordan: and in the second place, the great prophets, notably Isaiah, Ezekiel, Zecharia, had represented the salvation of the future under the form of pictures of washings and purifications, and living streams of water flowing from God; now exhorting the people, "Wash you: make you clean:" now consoling them in God's name, who was to wash away the sins of Israel with pure water, and with refreshing streams to drench the wastes, and quicken them to new fresh verdure.† If we are minded to seek for the reasons of John's Baptism nearer at hand, viz. in the surroundings of the time rather than in the ancient prophets, we may recall the lustrations of the Essenes in general, and especially the grades of lustration for novices and the threefold purification of women, before their entrance on married life;

* Washing before sacrifice, 1 Sam. xvi. 5. 2 Chron. xxx. 17. Ezra vi. 20. Jos. Ant. 14, 11, 5. The pure the impure, cf. Exod. xix. 10. Num. xix. 19. 1 Sam. xvi. 5. Jos. Ant. 3, 11, 1. Cf. Winer and Herzog, *A. Reinigkeit*.

† Exod. xix. 10 ff. Cf. Maimon. ap. Lightf. 265, per tria in fœdus missus est Israel, per circumcisionem, baptismum et sacrificium. Baptismus fuit in deserto antedatam legem (Exod. xix.) Isa. i. 16. iv. 4. Mic. vii. 19. Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 29, 33. Zech. xiii. 1. Life-giving water, Isa. xxxv. 7. xli. 18. xliv. 3 f. Zech. xiv. 8.

only we may not disguise from ourselves the great unlikenesses in the midst of this likeness, nor overlook the important connexion subsisting in the first instance between John and the national prophetic institution.*

But a wholly void and deceptive semblance has beyond doubt been followed by those who among the influences of the time have reckoned, rather than the Essenes, the so-called Jewish baptism of proselytes, the antiquity of which, since the beginning of last century, has been the subject of very vigorous disputes between the different sects; not, it is true, apart from a dogmatic interest, for or against, baptism with water and the baptism of children; until in the present century a purely historical interest led C. G. Bengel (1814) to attempt the demonstration of the antiquity, and Schneckenburger, 1828, that of the more recent existence of the Baptism of Proselytes, as subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem.† Doubtless the truth will lie midway, in as far as the Baptism of those who came over to Judaism did not become a fixed ordinance of paramount weight until a later period, whereas the ablution of heathen converts before participation in the Temple sacrifice, must have been, as we have seen above, an observance of high antiquity, and one thoroughly grounded on the general spirit of Judaism, and for that very reason indicated here and there in earlier times.‡ On the other hand, however, it is in the

* Jos. B. J. 2, 8, 7. 13. p. 241 note. The difference is not only that the washings of the Essenes were repeated, with John the baptism is once for all, but that the washings in the former case were by no means the immediate means of initiation into the order: they are only the forecourt in which the novice long stays, the introduction is effected by the vow, and the first participation in the sacrificial meal. The threefold purifications of women in three years have a sexual connexion (*καθαρμοί*).

† Bengel on the antiquity of the Jewish baptism of proselytes. Tüb. 1814. Schneckenburger likewise, Berlin, 1828. The literature of the subject in Winer and Herzog, *Proselyten*. Even Renan, p. 100, still thinks of the baptism of proselytes.

‡ Similarly Winer and Leyrer in Herzog. Especially significant is it that the schools of Shammai and Hillel already disputed about washings, and Rabbi Joshua maintained the existence of *Baptismus apud patres*.

very last degree the reverse of likely that John, who baptized Jews, should have taken any account of a usage, meant in the first instance to apply only to unclean heathens, and should have transferred it to those whom he baptized. Such an opinion could only arise where men had no notion of the national character of John's Baptism, and fathered upon the Baptist as well as on Jesus, a non-national, universally human enterprise; in fine, one might say, one positively friendly to heathendom.*

The confession of sins too, which John required of candidates for his baptism, is founded in the most intimate way upon the Old Testament. Confessions of guilt had been demanded already by the Law in special cases, and on the great day of Atonement the High Priest, as the people's representative, confessed all the misdeeds of the children of Israel over the head of the victim.† Thus Moses, the Prophets, and other heroes of the people took the confession of the popular guilt upon their souls, or, like Joel, summoned the priests to pronounce it.‡ In the Psalms it is pious individuals, David above all, who relieve their consciences before God.§ But specially significant for the later period was the promise given already in the Law, then in Solomon's dedication speech, then by a hundred prophetic voices, that with repentance and the confession of sins the time of God's blessing should begin.|| Hence the loud acknowledgments of sin by Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel, the whole people, and hence too the sacred legend still found in Philo, and the later rabbinical writings, that the Messiah would be there, when the people should increase in the recognition and confession of their sins.¶ Nowhere does John appear

* Meyer after all still believes that in Matt. iii. 9, John showed himself free from particularism.

† Cf. Numb. v. 7. Lev. xvi. 21.

‡ Exod. xxxii. 11 ff. Num. xiv. 13-19. Dan. ix. 4 f. Ezra ix. 6 ff. Neh. i. 6. Joel ii. 12-17.

§ Ps. xxv. 7. xxxii. 5. xxxviii. 19. li. 1 ff.

|| Lev. xxvi. 40. Deut. iv. 30. xxx. 2. 1 Kings viii. 33 ff. Isa. i. 16 ff. xlii. 24. xlviii. 18. lv. 7. lix. 20. lx. 1 ff.

¶ Ezra ix. 6. Neh. i. 6. Dan. ix. 4. The people themselves, Neh. ix. 2. Philo above, Vol. I. p. 316. Rabbis, p. 225.

more entirely as the herald who would usher in perforce the fulfilment of the promise, than when he lures and constrains his people to confession. From his own age he had not learnt this way of salvation: the Pharisee confessed before God chiefly his virtues; the Essene vowed righteousness, without speaking of repentance: he only coincided with the Essene in the fact that he pledged the people simultaneously with their repentance to a service of righteousness, which, at least as the formula is given by Josephus, was as like the entrance vow of the Essenes as it was to the demands of the prophets.*

The call of John had sounded, "Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The ground of the summons to repentance must therefore be necessarily also the aim of his preaching. Yes, even the form of this repentance, this baptism, this confession of sin, everywhere more or less palpably related to the loftiest of Old Testament promises, demanded a clear and open final deliverance as to the import of the divine era which was approaching. Two Gospels, Matthew and Luke, have, in complete accordance with this requirement, placed John's preaching of the Kingdom last, whereas Mark, on the contrary, it must be owned, overleaping the preaching of repentance, introduces the preaching of the Kingdom just as if that had been all, or the only important point: while finally the fourth Gospel hurries over the whole historical ministry of the Baptist, and reaches the level of the later Christian view, which makes it appear as though John arose, not as preacher of repentance, nor as preacher of the Kingdom, but solely as the usher in God's name of Jesus into the presence of the world.†

Nothing is more certain at the outset than that John thought of the coming kingdom of God as essentially a

* Pharisees, cf. Luke xviii. 11, and Josephus, p. 238. Among the Essenes no trace of repentance, but the vow of righteousness. Jos. B. J. 2, 8, 7, corresponds essentially with the vow administered by John, Ant. 18, 5, 2.

† Matt. iii. 11 ff. Luke iii. 15 ff. Mark i. 7 ff. John i. 30, 31.

kingdom of fundamental ethical institutions. The preacher of hearty repentance and holy resolves must either have had this higher view of God's kingdom to start with, or he must by his very preparation have arrived at that view athwart the imperfect conceptions of his time. Evidently with the Baptist, the former rather than the latter was the case; standing as he did so much upon the ground of the prophets,—of an Isaiah—who describes the kingdom of God as so essentially a kingdom of righteousness and holiness: all the more considerable no doubt was the chasm which sundered him from an age, which, in the person of a Judas of Galilee and of so many patriots, dreamt only of victory and the vengeance of an arm of flesh in the face of heathendom. How thoroughly the life of John was devoted to this loftier idea, is shown by his utter silence concerning earthly power and glory. It is the problem of good and evil which, as the Gospels represent, finds its solution in the kingdom of God and in its embodiment; it is a fellowship of the fear of God with human righteousness, which, according to Josephus, is to be established.* At the same time, nevertheless, he thought of a mighty power in this kingdom, making a clearance of the evil, defending and furthering all that was good, just as the prophets had to tell of a Rule and Sceptre of Righteousness in Israel. To this idea of his, side by side with his preaching, not only the apprehension of a political disturbance on the part of those in power bears witness; but especially the subsequent misgivings of the Baptist himself concerning Jesus, whose appearance in the unambitious guise of a teacher seemed lacking in authority, in strenuous action, in seizing the reins of popular control.† How John depicted in his own mind the attitude of this new rule of God towards the heathen power in the Holy Land, of that indeed not a trace has transpired. He can scarcely have thought the two compatible. Such a notion

* 18, 5, 2: τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνη καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εὐσεβείᾳ
 χρωμένους.

† Matt. xi. 1 ff.

is at issue with the unlimited sovereignty which he claimed for the Lord of the Kingdom, and the demand that all impurities in God's field should be done away, disfigured as the latter was by heathendom above all else.* Equally well, in accordance with numerous hints in Isaiah himself, may he have believed in a destruction of heathendom by the wonder-working arm of God, as in a voluntary desistance on the part of "the eagles" from the booty they had seized, stricken by that religious awe in presence of God's resuscitated people, which Philo of Alexandria expected.† This moral kingdom of God he portrayed above all as a kingdom of rigorously righteous retribution. And to the preacher of repentance it was most natural to describe the wrath to come, the axe with the inexorable stroke of death laid against the unfruitful trees in Israel, the unquenchable fire for the chaff on the threshing-floor of the heavenly husbandry; thus he drove the people to flee through baptism in water from the baptism by fire which should come.‡

Yet there enters at least an under-tone of milder, kindlier colouring into this picture of the future. The Lord of the kingdom will not merely destroy, but also gather; if, as the husbandman upon the threshing-floor, he flings forth the threshed fruits of his field to the wind, yet all will not be so light as to fly far and wide like chaff that is bound for the fire; many a heavy grain of wheat will fall down near him, and this his corn he will carefully gather into his garner and preserve.§ Thus the Lord of the kingdom appears also in the light of a Gatherer, Fosterer, Guardian and Rewarder of all that is good in Israel, before all of the penitent spirits, which bear away

* Matt. iii. 12, διακαθαριεῖ τὸν ἄλωνα αὐτοῦ.

† Vol. I. p. 316 f. Cf. Isa. ii. 2 ff. xi. 4. lii. 1 ff. lii. 15. lx. 3, 10, and elsewhere.

‡ Matt. iii. 7-12. Verse 12 requires us to explain the fire in verse 11 accordingly, and not in the sense of a purification (Mal. iii. 2 f.), but of a consumption.

§ For the purification of the threshed corn sieves and winnowing fans were used. The latter especially in Isa. xxx. 4: barachal ḡammisreh. Cf. Winer and Herzog, A. Dreschen, Ernte.

from Jordan noble fruits of repentance. And he is yet more than this. John is so far a Jew, and so far a man of manful effort and action, that he believes in a dignity in man, in a power in man to fulfil good works well pleasing to God, almost to the point of maintaining that the Lord of the kingdom has, spiritually, nothing to give, nothing freely to bestow: but needed only by dint of his august decree to add to that which had grown up of itself the seal, so to speak, of his registration, by way of acknowledgment or rejection. Still John is no stranger to the notion of Grace. Is it only the importunate earnestness of his exhortation to action, that makes him conceal this grace, or is it that his inmost spirit was not spared the uncertain wavering between the self-consciousness of personal performance, and the consciousness of need struggling for higher help, that ceaseless vacillation to which all mankind is subject? We shall believe the former: not only because that explanation is possible, and worthy of the greatness, yes, above all, the clearness of this mind; but because his words amid all his reserve speak out the conscious need of his time in accents loud enough—a need which besides his whole experience set so vividly near before his eyes. The Preacher of Human Performance, after all, waked at the same time, yes, before all things else, the longing for divine forgiveness. He had the consciousness that even the earnest, willing, change of mind, much as he demanded it, urgently needed as it was, could not make man just. For it is plain after all from the Gospels as well as from Josephus, that he set in motion the thought and hope of forgiveness on the Lord's day of wrath among all strata of the people, and that he could promise deliverance to the grossly sinful believers, the publican and the profligate, not on the ground of their subsequent performance, though he required it, but only in the first resort, on the ground of forgiveness.*

* Jos. Ant. 18, 5, 2: *παραίτησις ἁμαρτιῶν — ἀγνεία — ψυχῆς προεκκεκαθαρμένης — βάπτισις ἀποδεκτή*. Matt. iii. 7: *φυγεῖν ἀπ' ὀργῆς*. Mark i. 4. Luke iii. 3: *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*. Cf. Isa. xxxiii. 24. Iv. 7.

Once more, in addition to the forgiveness of sins—as a new confirmation of its necessity—he bade the new community of God look for a new gift of God's Spirit. "He that cometh after me will baptize with the Holy Ghost and with Fire."* By the fire indeed he understood according to the plain meaning of the context not a divine gift of purification and inward cleansing, as has often been supposed by those who too hastily compared passages from the prophets, but the wrath of God which with unquenchable fire smites the chaff; by the Holy Ghost however he can only have understood the blessing of a divinely bestowed superior willingness and aptitude for righteousness, for deeper knowledge and more intimate communion with God—granted to the penitent and godly, whose godliness was but feeble after all.† True, the account of Josephus knows nothing whatever of this promise of a divine bestowal of the Spirit, but only of a self-wrought righteousness: true, the objection is natural enough that Christianity may have first interpolated this prophecy of the Christian Spirit of Pentecost, and this self-drawn distinction between the baptizer with water and the baptizer with the Spirit.‡ Yet in point of fact this utterance was natural enough to the Baptist with his insight into the spiritual need of his time, in sight of the sinners who surrounded him, and with his intimate resort to the prophets who from Joel and Isaiah onwards longed for the Messianic gift of God: and if he really, as we shall see, pointed to one that should come, who was to be stronger than himself, whose sandals he was not worthy to lift; he must have looked for this strength not only in chastisement and iron rule, and the blessing of that strength, which the context demands, not only in the gathering of wheat into the garner; but must have ascribed to him a higher lifegiving, spiritual function, and we should be at a loss to find any other than this

* Matt. iii. 11.

† Cf. p. 249, n.

‡ Cf. Acts i. 5 ff. Yet this passage is certainly not meant to deny the historical validity of Luke iii. 16, but only to indicate the fulfilment.

spiritually creative one.* Thus then the spiritual stars of the moral kingdom of God, now approaching,—are forgiveness and the Spirit of God, beneath whose life-fraught stream the completed righteousness and the full-eared wheat first grow for the garner of God. And the greatest feature in the Baptist's greatness will have been this, that, after all this final summoning up of Israelitish morality, he concluded with the consciousness of finite limitation, with the recognition of the need of new divine creative energy :—a hero full of lowliness, a whole, self-conscious man,—with a grand appeal to the God of heaven, who, mightier than the freedom and the power of man, alone can break the chains that bind him, and fill the breaches that hem his progress.

But how did John now conceive his Kingdom of God ? personally or impersonally ? Personally, we may be certain, so surely as from time to time he introduces a Ruler. But is the Ruler God himself, the theocratic God, or an earthly vicegerent, the theocratic Prince of the People ? The Gospels admit no doubt on this head. True they enable us to perceive—that is, Matthew and Luke do—that John in his first announcements of the Day of Judgment set in the foreground the action of that God who was able of the stones to raise up children unto Abraham ; and in the Acts of the Apostles Luke goes so far as to place the open preaching of the Messiah on the part of John as late as the end of his career ; yet afterwards they make him speak openly of an earthly Ruler, whom the Gospels of Mark and John indeed introduce from the very beginning ; while Luke indicates that John had spoken far more fully than we now know of the consolation of Israel.† At the same time Matthew and Mark again form so far a group by themselves as that John in their account begins to speak of this ruler of his own accord, while according to Luke, alike in the Gospel and in the Acts, it is the

* Cf. Joel ii. 28. Isa. xi. 2. xxxii. 15. xlii. 1. xliv. 3 f. li. 7. liv. 13. Ezek. xxxvi. 25-27.

† Matt. and Acts. loc. cit. Luke iii. 18. Acts xiii. 25.

people,—according to the fourth Gospel an embassy from the hierarchy, who elicit this secret from the Baptist.* By the successor of whom John speaks in all the Gospels, the stronger one, in whose presence he himself is not worthy to perform the most menial of servile offices, who baptizes with spirit and with fire, who has his fan in his hand, gathers the wheat of his field, and burns the chaff, he cannot possibly have understood God himself, he must have meant a man, with whom he could at all events compare himself, and whom he can call his successor. In this sense to begin with all the Gospels alike have taken it, in that they straightway show the successor in Jesus, without, however, so far ascribing anywhere to John an acquaintance at the same time with the person of “Him that should come;” in this light must John himself have regarded the matter, if, not to speak of the events at the baptism, he some time later sent to ask Jesus whether he was the Messiah, or whether men must needs wait for another.† The doubt of our day may, indeed, allow itself to ask in reply: Did John really thus speak of one that should come, or do even these stories and speeches belong simply and solely to the Christian legend, which desired to stamp John as the prophet of the Messiahship of Jesus.‡

We are here not yet concerned to ask, did the Baptist name Jesus as the Messiah, but simply did he name any Messiah at all as destined to come? Nothing could be harder than to give a negative answer to this question. To begin with these unanimous reports of the Gospels are not easily thrown overboard; and certainly it were most perverse of all to deny the putting of the Baptist’s question when in prison, “Art thou he that should come?” as in this story the incident itself, and still more the

* Luke iii. 15. Acts xiii. 25. John i. 19 ff.

† Matt. xi. 1 ff. If the Gospels make John altogether the forerunner and without doubt assume that his pointing to Him that should come according to the will of God referred to Jesus, yet are they very far from ascribing to John at the outset an acquaintance with the person of Jesus; cf. below. Thus also is Acts xiii. 25, to be understood.

‡ Cf. Strauss, p. 187 ff. 194 ff. 403 ff.

speeches of Jesus concerning John which form the context, bear the stamp of the most genuine and uninventible tradition.

Josephus, it is true, knows no more of any announcement of a Messiah than he does of any announcement of a kingdom. But this silence is sufficiently explained by the known reserve of this writer with regard to his people's hopes for the future, which in presence of the Roman jealousy from Vespasian to Domitian the pusillanimous flatterer preferred to point to the victorious Emperor himself; while, notwithstanding this, there is infinite eloquence in his own confession in the next line of the anxiety entertained by the tetrarch Antipas of a possible revolt, of innovations and revolutions, *i.e.*, of a pretendency, although the immediate object of that monarch's suspicion was only John himself, the newly risen and mighty authority among the people.* To all these testimonies we may add the fundamental thought embodied in the whole enterprise of John's ministry; one must erase this enterprise if one would erase the Messiah; he who in unison with the prophets announced the Day of the Lord, the Day of Wrath and Grace, he must surely in unison with those same prophets and with the entire conception of his time have furnished the Day of God with hand and arm, he must have preached an instrument of God—a Messiah. How John was led to set in near prospect before the people a Messiah, *i.e.*, the living reality of all Israel's ideals, a person accordingly of infinite grandeur, exalted above all others, himself included, already born at the time, and actually present, inasmuch as he was shortly to appear, and yet at the time so invisible that only he, John the servant, was at work, while the whole nation, man for man, stood like a speechless infant at his feet—that was a riddle, and yet after all it was none. We shall find that John up to this hour had staked his trust in no man in all Israel. But he who could believe on reliable indications that the Day of the Lord would come, could not be at a loss with regard to God's ambassador; and he who could not doubt

* Ant. 18. 5, 2.

that God could raise up children unto Abraham from the stones of the desert, he dared not doubt that He who of old raised up a Moses, a Samuel, a David from any cottage in Israel, could call the Man, and with the unction of the Spirit lift him to the climax of the age. Was not just this, indeed, all of a piece with the Messianic faith that the Messiah was to be small in his beginnings, and unbeknown, both to himself and others, until the day of his calling, or until the day of his anointing by Elias, in truth a sudden appearing, as it were from the depth of the sea.* Thus John calmly waited for the Messiah, while he waited for God. And since he himself in God's name had entered on the calling of Elias, he might hope that he himself would introduce him, and in introducing him, as a servant, loose the latchets of his shoes.†

b.—THE ASSEMBLY OF CONSECRATION IN THE WILDERNESS.

That was a wondrous assemblage of people, which began to enliven this desert stillness, and to whelm the low murmuring, else undisturbed, of the rushing sacred flood.

All eyes fastened on the man in the garment of hair, whose high prophetic form instinct with spiritual fire, betrayed alike the most unbending strength, and the severest sacrifice of self-denial, in whose melancholy glowing eye the suffering and the hope of Israel were fixed; as he greeted the arrivals from the wilderness with the loud call to repentance, and the

* Esdras, xiii. 12. 25 f. 51 f.; xiv. 9, 13, 25; quod vidisti virum ascendentem de corde maris: ipse est, quem conservat altissimus multis temporibus, &c. 51 f.: et dixi: hoc mihi ostende, propter quod vidi virum ascendentem de corde maris? Et dixit mihi: sicut non potest scrutinare vel scire quis, quid sit in profundo maris, sic non poterit quis super terram videre filium meum, nisi in tempore dici. Justin, Dial. c. Tryph. 8; Χριστός εἰ καὶ γεγέννηται καὶ ἔστι πον, ἀγνωστός ἐστι καὶ οὐτε αὐτός πον ἑαυτὸν ἐπίσταται οὐδὲ ἔχει δύναμιν τινα, μέχρις ἂν ἔλθῶν Ἥλιος κρίσῃ αὐτὸν καὶ φανερὸν πᾶσι ποιήσῃ. Similarly Bab. Sanh. f. 97: Three things come unawares, the Messiah, a find, and a scorpion. Oehler, Messias 417 ff. 435 f. Cf. moreover Lücke on John vii. 27; Dillmann, Henoch XXIV. In part O. T. passages are the foundation, as Is. xi. 1; liii. 8. Mic. v. 2. Ezek. xvii. 22 ff. Zech. ix. 9 f. Cf. Hebr. vii. 3.

† Matt. βαρβάσαι (bear); Mark, Luke, John, λύσαι (loose sandals). Cf. Is. v. 27.

wrathful word of reproof, especially where his penetrating glance discovered sinful levity—as a prelude to leading them down by groups, in person it would seem, without the aid of disciples, to the Jordan, and then after earnest and searching acknowledgment of sin dipping them one by one in the water. Then upon the bank the baptized would pray; many of them doubtless with many tears and with loud cries and sighs, most of all those sinners, whose earnest penitence, side by side with the mighty form of John, most deeply moved Jesus himself.* All were desirous of beginning a new life of purity; thus each, forgetful of the old law, and full of trust in the new man, desire to learn more in detail what his new status required of him, “What then, prithee, shall we do?”

The third Gospel gives the questions and the pithy replies, which were limited altogether to the circle—so much forgotten by the Pharisees—of the most urgent, general and particular, duties to fellow men: he who hath two cloaks, let him give one to the poor; he who hath two loaves, let him do even so! We recognize here the Ebionite source; but so—or thereabouts—he must have spoken; so would Isaiah himself have said. The publicans he counselled to eschew the fraudulent till; and the soldiers the increase of their wages by means of extortion and defamation.† The Gospels have only been far too chary in their reports of these scenes by the Jordan, and have not even clearly marked the order of the transactions: the above is probably the truest rendering of the hints they have given. These assemblages for consecration grew, beneath the influence of the messages of those who returned, to ever increasing dimensions, until they became an affair of the whole nation. At first it was the neighbourhood, Jerusalem, Judæa,

* *ἱξομολογούμενοι*, detailed confession. Immersion, cf. Mark i. 10. Prayer, Luke iii. 21. Sinners, Matt. xxi. 32.

† Luke 3, 10 ff. Presbyter de antiquis ap. Iren. 4, 30, 3: qui enim habet duas tunicas det ei qui non habet; et qui habet escam, similiter faciat. Cf. Is. lvi. 6-10. The under garment next the body the most needful for the poor, Matt. v. 40. Cf. Winer, *Clothes*. Renan, 102 ff. finds here traces of a community of goods.

and Peræa which were on the spot; here too first the nearest, then the more distant population. Thereupon the North, the inflammable Galilee as far as Lebanon, together with the land east of Jordan, was seized by the religious current: caravans of men, beasts and provender covered the roads of Galilee and Judæa, and the plain of the Jordan. Every one left his calling and his work standing still, even the most passionately mercantile, even the servant of the Romans, and of the Princes. Matthew and Mark count up the districts and the crowds, but break off already at Judæa and Peræa: a sign that the afflux from the south was after all the greatest; Luke gives no list of the people, but speaks of the baptism "of the whole people," and also gives a list at the outset of the princes of all the countries of the Palestine of that time. Thus, too, Josephus relates the flocking of the entire nation.* All ranks were here represented, all in Israel, high and low, sacred and secular, upright and corrupt,—honest purpose and sham pretence,—friends and foes of Rome alike. Here were Scribes, Pharisees and Sadducees, high-priests, priests, Levites and elders of the people; here, above all, were landowners, large and small, with plentiful supply of bread; here were warriors from Peræa, from the army of the tetrarch Antipas; perhaps also proselytes from the Roman garrison at Jerusalem, to whom the purification in the Jordan was yet more congenial than the Jewish circumcision; here too were Roman and Herodian publicans, born Jews, but of ill fame among the people, as the history of Jesus shows, by reason of the double odium which they incurred through their legal as well as their dishonest extortions; here finally among the circle of Israelitish women, who also came to the baptism, were the offscouring of society, the ministers of

* Luke iii. 1, 21. Acts xiii. 24: *παντι τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραήλ*. Matt. iii. 5, 13. Mark i. 5. Cf. Matt. Jerus. *all* Judæa, *all* the land of Jordan. Mark, *all* Judæa, *all* Jerusalem. Jos. 18, 5, 2. *οἱ Ἰουδ.—καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι συστρεφόμενοι*. That work was left standing and lying is a matter of course in all such movements, but cf. especially the publicans and soldiers who are on the spot.

vice.* All, even the classes rejected by the Pharisees and Essenes, sought a share in the salvation of Israel, or at least to make believe; desired to take, to seize it, or at least to look, to examine, and reconnoitre. On the whole the success of John was indubitable, and that beyond what he could have believed.† Here all was so new, so mighty, so terrific, and so blissful at once; the wilderness, the river, a prophet after the lapse of long centuries, whose right in the name of God to deny, to reject, to destroy all the present with all its powers, was, as it always had been, firmly established in the consciousness of this people; the word, the sign, the kingdom, the Messiah, the best-beloved names in a cruelly iron age, the very gathering of the masses in such unheard-of numbers, the traceable effect, the visible sanctification; the contrition of the coarsest elements of the populace, the publicans, and sinful women—all wrought with such effect that the word of John found the echo of an unparalleled acceptance. From his own impressive rite he was called shortly “the Baptist,” a name which remained to him in the Gospels as well as in Josephus; he was addressed as teacher, and more than that as Prophet.‡ Outward, sensuous wonders, indeed, like those of Elijah, he manifestly wrought none, and perhaps too on that account the people never called him Elias; but his word with its unheard-of wondrous power, his prophesying and even his baptismal sign were “from heaven,” and even his subsequent imprisonment and death could not, according to the unanimous testimony of Josephus and the Gospels wipe out the impression which the whole people held to with noble, yes passionately excited tenacity in face of the cowed hierarchy: that “he was a prophet.”§

* Matt. iii. 7, xxi. 32. Luke iii. 10 ff. John i. 19 ff. † Cf. p. 242.

‡ John “the Baptist,” esp. in Matt. iii. 1; xi. 11 ff. (words of Jesus); xvii. 13. On the other hand, ix. 14. xxi. 25 ff. only John (partly in Jesus’ words). Jos. loc. cit: ‘Ιωάννου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Βαπτιστοῦ. Teacher, Luke iii. 12, Prophet, Matt. xi. 9, xxi. 26.

§ Wonders denied, John x. 41. Implied at bottom also, Matt. xi. 1 ff. iii. 1 ff.

Indeed by the Jordan at least the people went still further. Two later Gospels, Luke and John, supported by some hints in the Book of James, indicate the awakening belief of the people that the Baptist himself would be the Messiah.* This statement may have its foundation in later reflexion on the word of the Baptist, in which he designates his relation to the Messiah as that of the servant to his master, and in these Gospels is actually found in connexion with this speech of John, which it introduces, while in Matthew and Mark that introduction is wanting. But in itself it is likely that the popular mind, once inflamed, in the midst of this grand soliloquy of the whole community with itself, where every impression transformed itself with the electric speed of lightning into an intensification of feelings, wishes, and expectations,—would even outleap the message of the Baptist to the boldest inferences—that standing on the threshold of the kingdom of God, it would be unable to resist the temptation of beholding that which was to come, and Him who was to come, momentarily present in the body, along with the immediate presence of the Forgiveness of Sins itself: in whom else then, than in the man who stood a head higher than all Israel,—in John? In point of fact Josephus, as well as Luke, shows us that the multitudes were not scattered at once after the Baptism, but staid expectant, and, indeed, deliberating: and Josephus in particular declares quite openly that the people, wrought to the highest pitch of excitement by the Baptist's addresses, in their unbounded confidence in himself, stood ready for any or everything, even to the overthrow of all constituted authority.† This statement does not subvert

Acts xiii. 24. Matt. xiv. 2, no proof of former signs. In his supposed resurrection lies the ground not only of his mighty preaching, but also of the signs he works. The continued belief of the people, Matt. xxi. 26. Jos. 18, 5, 2. That the people nevertheless did not hold him to be Elias, is implied in Matt. xi. 14.

* Luke iii. 15. John i. 19 ff. Jac. xxiii. : μέλλει βασιλεύειν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

† Loc. cit. πάντα ἐψέκσαν συμβουλῇ τῇ ἐκείνου πράζοντες. With the expression *συστρεφόμενοι* (crowding together) of Josephus should be connected that of Luke : *προσδοκῶντος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ διαλογιζομένων* (iii. 15).

the Gospel accounts of the meek self-restraint of John; the sensuous, and in spite of all the moral regeneration of its ideas, —fist-clenched impatience of the people, so much in the true old style of Judas Galilæus, John actually withstood, though only to pay forthwith for his moderation with his blood; and Him that was to come he looked for now, as subsequently in his prison, in the person of another.

Besides the populace there was a circle of closest intimacy drawn round him by a flock of disciples which, if we may trust the traces which are furnished us, was of only gradual formation, due we know not how far to his calling, or to the influence of his attraction; they shared his life and those exercises of fasting which he personally retained, while his free broad views restrained him from bending others beneath their yoke.* One might conjecture, without, however, touching upon certainty, that John, like Jesus after him, chose out the number of twelve disciples, in conformity with the number of the tribes of Israel, as his most intimate associates.†

Strange to say, this Johannine movement overflowed even the boundaries of the Holy Land. In the last days of Pilate's procuratorship, there arose a Samaritan with the summons to his countrymen to follow him to the Holy Mount Gerizim, where he would show them the buried sacred vessels, which Moses himself had laid there.‡ The Mountain of Gerizim, the highest of the Ephraim hill-chain in Samaria, according to popular opinion the highest any where in the whole earth, forming the completest contrast to the rugged rockiness of the opposite Ebal, rising in fair shapeliness on most fertile soil immediately to the south of the primeval Sichem (Neapolis, Nablus), whose glorious stream-watered dale rich in gardens and fruit, it sheltered from the parching south wind,—this noble mountain

* Matt. ix. 14; xiv. 12.

† One might think of the remarkable twelve disciples of John in Ephesus, Acts xix. 7. Cf. sending out of disciples two and two by John and Jesus. Gesch. Christus, p. 24.

‡ Ant. 18, 4, 1-2.

had been crowned by the Samaritans after their rejection from the work of building the Temple at Jerusalem, since the times of Alexander the Great, by a Temple after the pattern of that of Jerusalem, in conformity with the Samaritan reading of Deuteronomy xxvii. 4 : and even after the destruction of this temple by the Hasmonæan John Hyrcanus, a destruction which even Herod, the Temple-builder, knew better than to repair, Gerizim remained not only a bulwark of defence and of freedom, but also the "Holy Mountain," to which the religious worship of the Samaritans and their hopes for the future attached themselves : thence, in times of excitement, as at the beginning of the Jewish War, 67 A.D., amid political and religious expectancy, the mountain was garrisoned by countless thousands of this nation.* Now the Tabernacle, the Ark of the Covenant, the Sacred Utensils of Moses had been painfully missed in the post-exile Temple at Jerusalem, and no less in that of Samaria ; but in both spots a re-discovery of them was hoped for, and brought into intimate connexion with the Messianic Day of Salvation.† The Second of Maccabees gives the Jewish legend that Jeremiah the prophet at the destruction of Jerusalem had hidden these sacred treasures of Israel, Tabernacle, Ark and Altar of Incense in a cave of Mount Nebo, from whose summit Moses was allowed to gaze upon the glory of Canaan, and had shut the door upon them in such a manner that even his companions could not find it, with the grand promise that God himself, in the future day of grace, when the people should be gathered again, would appear majestically in a cloud, as once to Moses, and reveal the hidden treasures.‡ This Jewish legend has its complete counterpart in that of Samaria, and to this day the Samaritans expect (like the Jews) their Messiah Shaheb ('Taheb), the "Leader back," who shall bring to light again the hidden ten

* Heb. Gerizim, Gr. Γαριζιν (ειν), Jos. Ant. 11, 8, 2 ff. 13, 9, 1 (Hyrcanus). Cf. Ezra iv. 1 ff. 2 Macc. vi. 2. Bulwark Ant. 14, 6, 2. ἀγνόρατον ὁρῶν 18, 4, 1. Jewish War, B. J. 3, 7, 32.

† Cf. 1 Kings viii. 1 ff. B. J. 5, 5, 5.

‡ 2 Macc. ii. 4-8.

commandments, the sacred utensils, and the Manna on Mount Gerizim, convert the world to the faith of the law, and reign as King of the earth.*

Clear enough, therefore, is the Messianic character of the Samaritan disturbance, and clear at the same time its likeness to the Johannine movement. This likeness is most patent in its external motives and results: here, as there, a step of desperation in face of the no longer tolerable insolence of Pilate a mighty concourse of the people in the village of Tirathaba, with the view of proceeding *en masse* to Gerizim, as the assembly of the desert meant to march to Jerusalem, a speedy transition on the part of the populace from religious zeal to political revolution; in Samaria an actual mustering in arms; finally, the lamentable issue, compassed in the wilderness by Antipas, on Gerizim by Pilate.† The religious kernel is different: there a moral regeneration, here a spiriting hither of salvation by the means of rusty Mosaic antiquities, and yet the same end, a Messianic future as a remedy for the cruel present. These resemblances must be kept in view, in order faithfully to restore the historical connexion in spite of differences, in spite of the complete severance of the events, and without the aid of late legends.‡ True, Josephus already separated the two, although he only puts a chapter between them; and he separated them in a very special manner, inasmuch as he, a genuine Jew, Pharisee, and Roman at once, can only designate the Samaritan ringleader in opposition to John as an unscrupulous liar and demagogue, which surely he can hardly have been. In view of the striking points of likeness, in view

* Cf. H. Petermann, Art. Samaria in Herzog XIII., 373. Also Bertholdt, Christol. Jud. 1811, p. 21 ff.

† Ant. 18, 4, 1-2. Otherwise the Samaritans were petted by Rome, Vol. I. p. 254, cf. p. 262. Note *.

‡ On Aenon and Salim John iii. 23, we may certainly not build, in order to find an entrance for the hypothesis of any contact between Samaria and John himself, much less still upon a late Christian Church of St. John in Samaria (said to have been founded by Helena Constantine's mother), together with grave of John which Damascus also claims to possess. Cf. Petermann, A. Samaria, p. 360.

of the evident simultaneity of these events, for the Samaritan movement falls precisely within the years of the appearance of the Baptist and of Jesus, 34 to 35 A.D. ; in view of the vicinity of the Jewish movement and the passage of the Galilæans through Samaria to the Jordan, it may be assumed with the highest probability that the Samaritan ferment was a peculiar, and doubtless a weak and unspiritual echo of the Jewish rising under John ; an opinion which is supported finally by the reflexion that the Samaritans, much as they always hated the Jews, and spitefully as they made use of the commencement of Roman supremacy for the profanation of the Temple at Jerusalem, nevertheless, from the end of the exile, from the time of the building of the Jerusalem Temple onwards until the last Jewish struggle for the Temple under Vespasian (66—70 A.D.) were but the feeble imitators of the sturdier and more original stirrings of the Jewish tribes.* A grating discord, however, was not unheard amid this rising, which from the Jordan and the wilderness, now for the second time, as erst in Joshua's day, planned the conquest of the Holy Land. True, it is a mistake to assume that the people, as John refused to countenance a blow of violence, turned from him again with all the speedier disappointment.† This opinion rests upon the exaggeration of a traditional taunt concerning John, as well as on the impression of the apparent passivity of the people when he was taken prisoner and executed ; and is immediately refuted by the admission that after all he left behind him the impression of a great prophet, who might be openly attacked by none. We have nothing but the statement, and that from the mouth

* Ant. 11, 8, 2 : *ναὸν ὁμοιον ὄντα τῷ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις*, 13, 9, 1 : *εἰκασθέντα τῷ ἐν Ἱ. ἱερῷ ναόν*. Arrangement of synagogues same as Jews, p. 156. Again the occupation of Gerizim simultaneous with the Jewish rising under Nero, B. J. 3, 7, 32. Side by side with this went on of course the hatred and the jealousy, cf. the desecration of the Temple in Jerusalem by human bones cast in by Samaritans, with the result that the feast of the Passover was utterly disturbed, as early as the first Procuratorship, that of Coponius Ant. 18, 2, 2. Passage of the Galilæans through Samaria, p. 9. Otherwise Jesus Matt. xix. 1.

† Weizsäcker, *Untersuchung*, p. 318.

of Jesus, that the stern asceticism of the Baptist provoked the taunt, "he hath a devil."* It was a word passed in popular circles, yet of a kind that neither portrays the final impression which he left of himself, nor could have owed its origin to this popular sphere of society. Plainly enough has Jesus himself showed in what sort of circles the core of the opposition lay: not among the people, that as one man jealously defended the prophet even after his ignominious death—but among the hierarchy.† From these dominant circles this saying about the Baptist was doubtless promulgated, just as the similar one concerning Jesus was immediately afterwards.‡ It is true the first Gospel relates that even the hierarchs came to the baptism of John, and even seems to indicate that they were actually baptized. It may be that the general drift of men's minds in that direction carried individuals of the class along with the current—some from religion, others from policy. But, speaking generally, there was here no sympathy. Jesus himself in the same Gospel reproaches the High Priest, Elders, and Pharisees with coming indeed as spies, but worse than publicans and harlots, neither repenting nor believing, and even in sight of this eloquent repentance, maintaining their incredulity. And at that very time they prudently evaded the question as to the worth in God's eye of the baptism of John.§ Now in reality, even the account of the baptism given by Matthew by no means says that the hierarchs were baptized, but merely that they appeared at the baptism, and were received by John as a brood of vipers, who would not escape the wrath to come. When he summons them to repent, and when he unfolds the meaning of his baptism, which he seems willing to bestow even upon them, it is after all not said that matters really came so far.

* *δαμόνιον ἔχει*, Matt. xi. 18.

† Matt. xi. 9; xvii. 10-12; xxi. 26, 32; xxiii. 13.

‡ The parallel saying about Jesus, Matt. xi. 19, is indeed also promulgated by the Scribes, Matt. ix. 11: just so the word of calumny corresponding to the reproach against John—that Jesus drove out devils by the Devil's means, *nay*, was himself the Devil. Matt. xii. 24; x. 25. § Matt. iii. 7, cf. xxi. 26-32.

Besides the declarations concerning the baptism are addressed to them in such a manner that they always concern the whole people, to whom Matthew has apportioned no special address, at the same time; therefore Luke accordingly on his part imagines all these words as addressed not to the hierarchs at all, but to the people.* It was natural that the hierarchy should at most take the part of spectators by the Jordan. The man who outflanked the dominant powers, who neither possessed nor desired any commission from them, who spoke of God, and usurped a right over the nation, who promoted new-fangled methods of piety, and a dangerous overthrow of everything, whether with or without the Messiah; such a revolution as, twenty-six years before, they themselves had energetically withstood in opposition to Judas and Zadoc—became for the Seat of Moses, especially in its Pharisaic form—for these traders upon the populace and the most fashionable piety, a startling and fear-inspiring stumbling-block. His baptism was the work of man, a breach of divine ordinances, his preaching of the kingdom not only threatened to break their power, but madly challenged the charge of Roman Legions.† Active opposition could not fail to arise, especially when the cruelly cold energy of the Sadducees, as of a Joseph Caiaphas in the neighbouring Jerusalem, held the reins, most readily supported in this position of affairs on one side by the Pharisees, whose rivalry never disdained the covenant of policy; on the other by the Romans, who, even apart from Pontius Pilate, looked distrustfully enough on any “herding together” of Jews since the time of Archelaus and Judas of Galilee. The fourth Gospel recounts that pretty nearly at the beginning of the movement an official embassy of the hierarchy, consisting of pharisaically-minded priests and Levites, came to the Baptist.‡ It was to make inquiries whether he

* Cf. with Matt. iii. 7 ff. Luke iii. 7 ff. Also remark on p. 237.

† Cf. Matt. xxi. 26, and the passages, p. 263, note †. Also Matt. iii. 7. John i. 24, which exhibit chiefly Pharisees. The Romans cf. John xi. 48.

‡ i. 19 ff. It is plain how easily the story might be formed from Luke iii. 15.

declared himself the Messiah, or at least Elias, or at any rate as the prophet of the future, by what authority he actually performed the baptismal rite; and as he answered "No" persistently to the first set of queries, the deputation was empowered to demand emphatically by what right he appeared thus publicly, a right which John on his part legitimated by pointing to a greater successor, whom he was to usher in. In itself and by itself considered, such a deputation, putting forth as it were a feeler to find how matters lay, has nothing impossible about it: only it is suspicious that none of the older Gospels know any thing about it; moreover, the context of the message is strange, the question far too strongly dogmatic and full of Messianic belief, even for the Pharisees, most of all for Sadducees; finally, the answer of John is partly a mixture of John's speeches to the people and the literary reflexions in the other Gospels; partly in so far as it contains any thing peculiar to itself, an artificial, enigmatical hinting at Him who was present unbeknown to the deputation, with whom all the while John himself, according to the other Gospels, yes, according to the plain implication of the context even in this Gospel, is as yet not at all acquainted.*

On all these grounds we must here seek less an historical account, than a significant ushering in, by the writer, of the Baptist who thus in a measure proclaims himself officially. A more reliable trace of the nets spread at Jerusalem for the Baptist, which even Jesus indicates, is supplied by his change of place. On this side Jordan, in Jewish territory he had as a Jewish prophet begun; on the yonder side of Jordan in Peræa, in the territory of the tetrarch Antipas, his activity closes: for it was not by the Romans, it

* John i. 23, *i.e.* John's self-designation as the *φωνή Θεοῦ* acc. to Isa. xl. 3, is in Matt. iii. 3, Mark i. 3, Luke i. 4, nothing but the free reflexion of these writers. The utterance however, John i. 26-27, stands in actual contradiction to i. 29 ff, according to which John only knows from God, that one will come, but not yet that he is there, or who he is.

was by Antipas, the ruler beyond the Jordan, that he was apprehended, and this is what is correct in the not quite correct account of the fourth Gospel, which reverses the order of affairs, making John begin beyond, and finish on this side, though much too far north, of the Jordan.* It was scarcely accidental that he exchanged the ground of Judæa for the yonder bank. There was nothing in his activity as Baptist in the wilderness, in the gathering of the people to favour the change, unless one were to believe that want of water, or high floods on the western bank, both quite improbable, especially on the long stretch of bank at his command upon the Jewish side—drove him across.† But it stands to reason, that his position in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem became threatened, so that he preferred, not indeed to move backwards and forwards, but to transfer his fixed centre of operations to that land where he had less to fear from Romans and hierarchs, and where a prince reigned whose fundamental character was an anxious and irresolute temper.‡ So it might come to pass that John and Jesus met in Peræa, the one a fugitive, so to speak, at the time from his country, the other in a measure on his own ground, in so far as Antipas was the territorial chief of Galilee as well as of Peræa.

SECTION II.—THE PROPHET AND THE NEOPHYTE FROM NAZARA.

1. THE BAPTISM OF JESUS.

Concerning the coming of Jesus to the place of national consecration we would gladly have heard side by side with the Gospels the neutral account of Josephus : yet we are not disappointed that Josephus should speak of everything besides, but of Jesus not a word. Our Gospels will themselves bear witness that the arrival of Jesus had no palpably extraordinary, not to say decisive, effect on the assembly in the desert. Just

* Cf. the passages above, p. 231 ff. The intrigues against John, culminating in his death, are mentioned by Jesus, Matt. xxvii. 12.

† As might seem from John iii. 23. Cf. Luke iii. 3. ‡ Above, Vol. I. p. 265 ff.

as little, it is true, are they able to confirm the modern fables about a politic compromise between Jesus and John. Whether Galilee, which is not expressly named by the Gospels, and, in company with this afflux from the north, Jesus too, came to the Jordan, cannot be seriously questioned in spite of Josephus and modern doubts. Supposing even we put the accounts of the Baptism all on one side, the fact remains that Jesus subsequently, in words that admit of no doubt, reminded the Galileans, not merely individuals among them, but the populace at large, of the pilgrimage to John which had taken place, and here and elsewhere, in Jerusalem too, spoke of these "days of John," in such a way that he must himself have been present, unless in utter defiance of the spirit of Jesus' life, we are to imagine him possessed of divine omniscience.*

Yet was it not for Jesus to go with the masses; thus his speeches in respect of John actually indicate pretty plainly the reverse of a journey in company with the crowd: and again it was not for him to be the first to depart for the spot; in the same speeches he accompanies his mention of the Galilean hankering after novelty with a vein of gentle satire.† Thus the Gospels are probably right in placing the appearance of Jesus not earlier than the climax of the Baptist's activity; Luke, in particular, at the time when the whole people were baptized, the Gospel of the Ebionites, actually after the baptism of the people.‡ One might indeed conjecture that it was the purpose of the Gospels to introduce Jesus thus late, in order to exhibit in his person the consummation and fulfilment of the Baptism of John, and from this permissible point of view one may admit that the expression used by the Ebionite Gospel is made too strong, in so far as it is actually unhistorical and

* Matt. xi. 7 ff. Galilee as such one may find hinted at already, iii. 5, 13.

† Loc. cit.: What went ye out for to see? A reed? An effeminate?

‡ Luke iii. 21: ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος. Ebion. Gosp. in Epiph. xxx. 13: τοῦ λαοῦ βαπτισθέντος ἤλθε καὶ Ἰησοῦς.

materially departs from the more cautious expression of Luke, in appearing to intimate that Jesus was the last of all the candidates. But to start with, Galilee, after all, though always so zealous to be on the spot at the festival in Jerusalem, must have come pretty nearly last in the extraordinary gathering on geographical and material grounds, inasmuch as the movement belonged primarily to the Roman province of Judæa: and again, on other grounds, on his own grounds, Jesus came with the last among the Galilæans; according to which, by a fair interpretation, even the Ebionite Gospel will still remain in the right.

The fourth Gospel reverses matters, and makes Jesus first on the spot, and the others last. From the spirit of the writer, with whom the baptism of the Baptist is nothing but a means of ushering Jesus in, this is intelligible enough, only not as actual history. By a large allowance of interpretation one might certainly make out that he does not depart so far from the rest. True Jesus, it might be said, is here present from the beginning: on the first day accordingly John receives the deputation from Jerusalem and declares to it the Man who is amongst them, on the second he sees Jesus coming to him; but that this is because his narration hastens to the core of the matter, and that the coming of the deputation itself presupposes that John some time before the coming of Jesus had contracted the suspicion of those in power by his baptism.* As to the arrival of Jesus in the presence of John the Gospels are very concise. In the older of them it looks quite as if Jesus only appeared for a day, for a moment, merely received baptism, and then immediately retired into the wilderness. And while Mark and Luke are content with relating the fact of the baptism of Jesus, Matthew roundly attributes to the journey of Jesus the intention of a baptismal pilgrimage from the very first.† Here it comes in contact with the Gospel of the Nazarenes, which as well as the Ebionite is a variety of

* i. 19 ff.

† Matt. iii. 13.

Matthew himself, and which makes Jesus go with reluctance to the baptism for the forgiveness of sins, because exhorted by his mother and brethren.*

If we leave this history to itself in the first instance, we must say as to Matthew, that to begin with, he spoke on his own account of an intention to be baptized when the journey was entered on, because it was actually the result of the journey; and still more must we maintain against all the Gospels on the Gospels' own showing that Jesus was not only a moment or even as the fourth Gospel more correctly, or at least more roundly reckons, three days, with John; nor yet with no further result than that of his own baptism.†

The rising reputation of "the prophet" with whom Jesus, spite of alleged relationships and friendships, was thus far wholly unacquainted, as the fourth Gospel assures us, and the saying of Jesus himself by its portrayal of the impressions of strangeness and surprising novelty produced by the Baptist's appearance, plainly presupposes, drove the Lord to forsake his posture of suspense, and personally to inspect what was going on by the Jordan.‡ The motives which might have kept him back were the independence and inwardness of his own religion, the calling which began to make itself heard within himself, and distrust of prophets and risings of the people by which Israel had of late been oftener deceived than delivered: the motives which drew him towards and into the movement, were something more than merely his desire to observe, or the impulse of popular inspiration, whose child he was; they were the lofty unambiguous names of Repentance, Righteousness, Sanctification, Kingdom of God, Messiah; names, realities, and fervent wishes, for which he lived himself, and which now the mouth of the populace was bearing busily through Galilee. Jesus saw the man whose spell brought life into the wilderness, and the

* Ev. Naz. ap. Hier. adv. Pelag. 3, 1: quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? Nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi ignorantia est.

† Cf. my *Gesch. Chr.* p. 22.

impression made on him, was not slighter than that made on the people. The garb, the man, and his speech proved to him that he had found no dainty nursling of the privileged classes, not to say of the palaces, and that he saw before him amidst the reeds of the wilderness shaken by the wind a hero in mind and sentiment.* This "way of righteousness," the moving symbol of baptism, verily fetched "from heaven," showed him the messenger of God and the announcement of that kingdom of God as at hand, which the stress of the times had suppressed, which Pharisæism had crippled, and yet which was sighed for in the hearts of the best, and as a holy passion was throbbing in his own, the loud ringing and sounding abroad of the best-beloved name, proclaimed with an assurance that made men conscious of an actual resuscitation—all conspired to raise his belief in the coming kingdom, and in that kingdom's herald, to an infinitude of confident and glowing conviction. John was to him a prophet and more than a prophet, the greatest of those born of women from the beginning of creation, the end of the vaticinations of Moses and the prophets, in good earnest the new Elias, the restorer of moral order among the nation, the herald of the ultimate ruler of God's kingdom.†

Thus glorious did John seem in his eyes in virtue of the imperious exaltation, the striking energy of his word alone; but, unless we would sunder what belongs together, he seemed doubly so to him, because here, as scarcely ever before in Israel, never in the experience of the present generation, the word of the prophet, instead of dying on the air, found wings, like a genuine word of Elias, a word of God that did not return unto him void, but hastened to action and fulfilment, a sudden stormwind sent from God, to which the reeds were bowed, an Isaianic gush of water from on high, changing the barren wilderness into a garden of the Lord. He beheld the most

* Matt. xi. 7 ff.

† Way of righteousness, xxi. 32. Baptism from heaven, xxi. 25. Prophet and more than a prophet, xi. 9-14, cf. xvii. 11 ff.

moving scenes of conversion through all the strata of the population, down to the publicans and sinners, the prospect of whose accession even a strong faith might well have resigned, but whose penitence could not but melt even the most sceptical and hardened unbelief; after the long silence of a spiritual ebb, he listened to the unlooked-for rushing of a spring-tide of glowing desires for the kingdom, a noble wrestling and fighting for the highest good by the souls of men, a catching and seizing at the Kingdom of God, the beating of whose waves only seemed to break itself against the haughty unbelieving spirits of the rulers of Jerusalem, and could not be broken after all.* These impressions of Jesus are vouched for by words of his mouth, which will not be denied, whose freshness and whose strength across milleniums glitter with diamond sheen, and show the life-blood of the age and of his own soul's life, as scarcely anything besides; and if one were inclined to conjecture, that at least the name of Elias will have been found by him for John at a later time, when his disciples taking their stand upon popular opinion asked concerning the return of Elias, and when he himself in the assured possession of the Messiahship, beheld and measured out the entire past in the light of fulfilment; much more by far are we compelled to believe, that it was nothing else but vivid intuition, assisted by striking resemblances, the immediate and visibly continuous reverberation of the impression, the instantaneous emotion wrought in the soul of Jesus on the one hand by the facts, on the other by thoughts of the kingdom and the Messiah, which in one happy moment precipitated his quietly expectant surmise, thus to solve the secret, who this prophet of the people was, "here is Elias!"

It is in the highest degree likely, that Jesus not only observed from afar the work of the Baptist, which he afterwards

* Publicans and sinners, the sight of whom ought at least eventually to have driven the Pharisees to repentance and faith. Matt. xxi. 32. Violent jostlings for the kingdom (this explanation now almost universal, and alone grounded in the context) xi. 12. Cf. xxiii. 18.

was enabled with such truth of detail and such fulness of conviction to portray and to eulogize, but that in intimate proximity he made his personal acquaintance. It is to be lamented that the Gospels tell us nothing about it, whereas it could not but have been of the highest interest to us, to have listened to the two Men of Israel, and to Jesus approaching the teacher sitting by the Jordan, as Justin Martyr has depicted the scene. But the thought offends us at the very outset, that Jesus should have surveyed the most kindred-minded of all Israel only from a shy distance.

If hereafter he desired to find in him a prophet with entire assurance, he must surely have tested him near at hand; and if he did find in him a prophet, he could not but be earnestly concerned to hear the Word of God from his mouth. In point of fact the Gospels after all do afford slight traces of a personal contact. Inasmuch as they admit his coming to the act of baptism, they concede beforehand a personal approach for the moment in question; but they allow at the same time for an extension of this moment, just as they do for that of the span of time in which Jesus' presence at the Jordan altogether is apparently comprised.

Matthew has in addition a deprecating utterance of the Baptist at the baptism, which if it be genuine can scarcely be interpreted otherwise than by a reference to a previous acquaintanceship.*

John mentions a coming of Jesus to the Baptist and a stay of some days in his neighbourhood, though without any mention of the Baptism of Jesus; nor is he silent respecting a subsequent saying of John's disciples: "He who was with thee beyond Jordan, now baptizeth."† Unintentional indications are still weightier. Jesus knows the private life of the Baptist and his disciples in respect of their ascetic abstinence, he has subsequent intercourse, demonstrably, with John and

* iii. 14.

† John i. 29. iii. 26.

his disciples, who finally announce to him the death of their master; he is very precisely informed (far otherwise than the people at large) concerning the system by which odium was excited against John, and ill-treatment practised upon him until his death, even as regards its ultimate authors behind the scenes; finally, according to the fourth Gospel, he actually drew away individual disciples of the Baptist from the wilderness to himself.* Last of all, he repeated the call of the Baptist to Repentance and the Kingdom in so many words when he entered on his career, and on many occasions used a language whose ideas and similes exhibit the most frequent echoes of the words of John.† These are facts which may be otherwise explained, but which are only explained with adequate probability by assuming a considerable intimacy, without at the same time following Renan in his flowery Oriental fancy, or the Jewish Toledoth in its lies.‡ This intercourse must in any case have taken place *before* the baptism of Jesus, as this itself may show: there is also no doubt that Jesus immediately after his baptism retired, and John almost simultaneously exchanged freedom for the gaol. The impressions of Jesus did not suffer beneath this closer examination:

* Matt. ix. 14. xi. 18. xiv. 12. xvii. 12. John i. 35 f.

† Cf. my *Gesch. Chr.* p. 33 f.

‡ Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 104 ff. 115 f. According to Renan, Jesus came already with a little school of followers to the Jordan. The two young enthusiasts associate, the more so as Jesus knows how to subordinate himself, is willing to grow under John's shadow, and to his injury adopts John's externalities and tone of authority. The Baptism, moreover, Jesus was forced to imitate, now that it had once attained such consequence through John's means. Thus the Jordan was covered with baptismal candidates; and so forth. Cf. also my notice *A. A. Zeit.* 1863. The *Toledoth*, ed. Huldr. p. 35 f. make Jesus, after his ejection by the Rabbis, and after the conditions of his birth became known, gather about him a number of scholars, i.e. bad men. To this alliance John joins himself, the *antesignanus hominum nullius frugi*, who gives Jesus the advice to make the washing of his disciples' heads with the water. Boleth, which destroys the growth of the hair, the mark of fellowship. The contempt here shown is also embodied in the tale that Jesus himself had been shorn by the Rabbis and smeared with Boleth as a sign of his birth. The mad legend is likewise founded on a reminiscence of the Nazarites and the shorn monks of Christendom.

only he felt an immediate revulsion from the ascetic strictness and gloomy enwrapment of the New Piety, and this very husk might lead him to surmise and to acknowledge that the foundations of his own God-consciousness and divine communion, in spite of all resemblances, had their ground in another spirit.*

Under the influence of these impressions, more than aught else, the resolution of Jesus ripened, to close directly with the general religious rising, and to submit to the sacred symbol which God had pleased to appoint. This resolution has indeed from ancient times appeared enigmatical, or even incomprehensible. Could Jesus humble himself before the Baptist, so as to take on himself a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins? Could the Baptist himself, without ceasing to be the prophet of the Messiah, immerse this candidate like other people? Accordingly the Gospel of Matthew has already a refusal on the part of the Baptist: "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" followed by the solution of the difficulty on the part of Jesus himself, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it beseemeth us to fulfil all righteousness," i.e., every ordinance of God.† These declarations are also vouched for or assumed by the Gospel of the Ebionites, which however has already lost their correct interpretation, then by the Epistles of Ignatius, probably too by Justin Martyr, when he denies Jesus' need of baptism.‡ The Gospel of the Hebrews and the Preaching of Paul went yet a step further, inasmuch as they are able to report a refusal of Jesus himself, in answer to his mother and brethren, to go in company with them to the Baptism of John for the Forgiveness of Sins: "Wherein then have I sinned, that I am to journey and

* ix. 14. xi. 18.

† iii. 14 f.

‡ In the Eb. Gosp. John begs, falling on his knees before Jesus after the voice from heaven, *δέομαι σου, κύριε, σύ με βάπτισον*. 'Ο δὲ ἐκώλυεν αὐτῷ λέγων. ἄφες, ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶ πρέπον πληρωθῆναι πάντα (the prophecy must be entirely fulfilled). Ign. Sm. 1: *βεβαπτ. ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικ. ὑπ' αὐτοῦ*. Just. Tryph. 88: *οὐχ ὥς ἐνδεία αὐτὸν τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι—οἶδαμεν αὐτὸν ἐληλυθέναι ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμόν*.

be baptized by him? unless this word of mine be itself but ignorance.”*

With these and other difficulties, with the absence of any need in Jesus for baptism and the receiving of the Spirit, must be connected the final fact that the fourth Gospel simply ignores any baptism of Jesus by John, and in spite of prevalent interpolation, allowed none to foist upon it the account of the Baptism contained in the other Gospels.

Now here it can indeed be open to no doubt, that these other Gospels are entirely in the right as against the fourth. The baptism of Jesus by John is assuredly no device of the later community, as Bruno Bauer conjectures, and the Jewish Christian belief in the necessity of an ushering and anointing of the Messiah by Elias or at least by John might incline us to believe: this community would not have devised any humiliations of Jesus, especially before John, such as after all were strongly accompanied by glorifications; and besides the undeniable coming of Jesus to the Jordan, and his own estimation of this “baptism from heaven” leads to the assumption of an actual performance of the rite. The best and indeed the historical explanation of the meaning of this baptism seems to be preserved in Matthew.† In point of fact it was natural that if Jesus and John had become acquainted, if John had obtained an inner glimpse of the spiritual life of Jesus, if he had been in any way, as we shall see he was, taken hold upon by him,—this baptism should not be performed without explanation. Add to this the fact that the Baptism of Jesus according to the account of Matthew and Mark was performed in any case in a different manner to that of the rest of the people, in a shorter, more compendious form, namely, as we must conceive it, without confession of sins, or a promise of

* Ev. Hebr. ap. Hier. adv. Pel. 3, 1: *ecce mater domini et fratres ejus dicebant ei: Jo. baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum, eamus et baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis: quid peccavi?* See p. 259. On *Praed. Pauli* cf. Anger *Synops.* ad h. l.

† Matt. iii. 13 ff.

the fruits of repentance, a fact that at any rate presupposes a previous discussion.* Finally, to think of this discussion in the form of the dialogue in Matthew, is fairly unobjectionable: John would thus greet Jesus not already as the Messiah, not even as the sinless one, but simply as his superior, as he might well surmise him to be. Jesus again evaded the dispute regarding his personal position, by simply keeping in view the divine ordinance of baptism, in which he really believed; untroubled at the same time concerning the subordinate question, as to whether the performance of the rite, to be acceptable to God, held good according to its idea only for sinners, or equally so for the righteous, two classes of mankind, whom he always distinguished. Still it must remain a question, whether the discussion between the two men took place exactly in this shape or in another. To begin with, the other Gospels contain nothing of this interlude recorded by Matthew, and those who in late times followed him. Then, the refusal of the Baptist stands at least in Matthew quite abruptly: for it does not arise in consequence of an acquaintance with Jesus, but at the moment of his coming. It would thus have to rest on the impression made by Jesus at the instant, which though it might be considerable, could not, according to all we know of the appearance of Jesus, afford scope for such a decision, unless we are to think of a special divine illumination, which in that case, however, would make superfluous all the subsequent wondrous signs from God, with their value as revelations. Besides it is after all not likely that a considerable impression, which did not at any rate amount as yet to a certain recognition of the Messiah as actually come, could have wrested from the Baptist forthwith the assurance of his divine commission, so heroically taken in hand in face of the entire nation, and have recommended his sudden, even hasty transition to

* Matt. iii. 16, cf. v. 6. Mark i. 10, cf. v. 5. Immediately he went up from the water; the people slowly with exhaustive confession of sin. As to the actual sinlessness of Jesus cf. meanwhile p. 176, *Gesch. Christ.* 109.

the attitude of a candidate for baptism. And let us here openly confess our preference for the Ebionite Gospel late as it is, to our own Matthew, inasmuch as it places the explanations that passed between Jesus and John, at the end instead of at the beginning, and after the striking signs from heaven. Now as to the origin of this narrative of Matthew let the case stand as it may, let it be held as original in spite of the silence of Luke and of Mark, in spite of the variations mentioned, and the partial preferability of the Ebionite document, in spite of the interrupted connexion; or let its later origin in the course of innovations in Matthew be freely admitted, in any case, we cannot build with certainty on Matthew's mode of bringing in the Baptism of Jesus, even on the supposition that the latter is thus actually explained and not altogether incorrectly.*

In what sense then did Jesus accept the Baptism of John, which he accepted so differently from others?

Since Justin Martyr found for the baptism, as for the sign of the dove, the explanation, which may be understood in so many ways—that it was accepted without any personal necessity for the sake of mankind, pretty nearly all the modern interpretations were already on the way to be given, from that of a Messianic consecration in the eyes of John and the people, this oldest of all views, and one obviously represented already in our Gospels, to that of a vicarious acceptance of alien performances and guilt down to death itself.† Doubtless these and such like theories will always continue to commend themselves more than the ungarnished belief of Strauss, which disgusted Rückert with the baptism of Jesus altogether,—that Jesus by his immersion in the river symbolically at all events made a confession of sins. In more temperate fashion Lange supposed a washing away of the impurities involved in communion with

* Ebion. Gospels. p. 274, n. ‡. Matt. iii. 14 f. an interpolation. See Vol. I. on the Gospel of Matthew, end.

† Just. Dial. c. Tryph. 88: οὐχ ὡς ἐνδεῖα—ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ γένους τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ib. διὰ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. This brings to mind after all John i. 29. Cf. Vol. I. on the Gospel of John: its age.

the people ; Schenkel, a personal acceptance of the guilt of the collective mass, a view in which modern belief offered its hand to ancient faith.* The Messianic consecration, which at one time was held to have its chief significance for Jesus, at another for John and the people, is to be found in all sorts of shapes, in the writings of Paulus, Schleiermacher and Hase ; according to Paulus Jesus sought for a final decisive token, according to Schleiermacher he intended by his baptism to recognize the preaching of John concerning the kingdom of God, and its sinless righteousness, and at the same time to connect with it in symbolic form the commencement of his own proclamation.† In the latter formula lie at the same time the germs of the conception of Jesus' baptism, as a personal vow, a view which has accordingly since found its representatives chiefly in Hase, Schenkel, and Weizsäcker.‡ And this view is the only right one. For a washing away of his own or other impurities the Baptism of Jesus could not have been, because the former scarcely existed, while the latter could not have been appropriated by Jesus at a time when the people itself was so movingly valiant in its reaction against its sins, and when he before all things had to fight out within himself the question of his own personal life. Again it was not a consecration to the Messiahship, because baptism had in itself such a wholly different significance, and because he could scarcely have started with the Messianic idea ready made. On the other hand that personal vow of the service of righteousness, which the Baptist especially in Josephus, but in the Gospels as well, so evidently required, the vow of complete self-equipment for the incipient Kingdom of God, Jesus could and must have taken on himself in the sense of those very words with which he overcomes the refusal of the Baptist ; and this undertaking

* Strauss, N. L. J. p. 195. Lange, 2, 176. Schenkel, Charakterbild, p. 46. Rückert, Rational. 126. Cf. Hase, 105.

† Paulus, p. 136 ff. Hase, p. 102 ff. Schleiermacher, p. 114 ff.

‡ Hase, Schenkel. loc. cit. Weizsäcker, p. 319.

of holy fealty to the Kingdom in the midst of the entire people now hallowing itself against the Day of the Lord, might doubtless afterwards awaken resolves in his soul, which subsequently should raise this act to the significance of a Messianic consecration and to the birthplace of a great redemption for the people.

In point of fact the Gospels have attached to this baptism of Jesus the most momentous results. These we shall in no way deny, fundamentally as we shall alter their shape. One may at the outset forget in some measure the differences with which the various sources have described the mighty events succeeding this baptism. When Jesus quickly emerged from the water, the heavens, as Matthew tells, were opened to him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and coming upon him.* And lo! a voice from heaven, saying, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." The accounts of the second century give, like Justin Martyr, instead of this word, the other, "This day have I begotten thee!" or actually, like the Ebionite Gospel, both cries in succession.† Indeed, according to the latter, yet another succeeded. For when simultaneously with the voice from heaven a sudden fire blazed up in the Jordan, John asked, "Who art thou, Lord?" whereupon *he* then received the heavenly voice, "That is my beloved Son, on whom I have set my favour." Now John fell at the feet of Jesus, saying, "I pray thee, Lord, baptize thou me." "Suffer it thus," answered Jesus, "for so it behoveth, that all should be fulfilled."‡ The significance of these events, spite of all variations in detail, the Gospels uniformly find in a sort of divine consecration to the Messiahship: to speak more particularly, in a twofold act, first in the endowment of Jesus with the Messianic Spirit, and in the production of a certainty

* Matt. iii. 16, 17.

† Just. Tryph. 88: *υἱός μου εἰ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*. Ev. Eb. ap. Epiph. xxx. 13; *σύ μου εἰ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ ἠνέδοκῃσα. καὶ πάλιν ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*.

‡ Loc. cit. p. 274, note †; and in Anger, Synops.

within him of his Messiahship by the grace of God : secondly, in a proclamation of Jesus as the Messiah in presence of John and the assembled people. In a striking manner accordingly Luke has placed the pedigree of Jesus at this supreme moment of Messianic Begetting, Endowment, and Proclamation.* The sending of the Spirit is in all the Gospels : the Spirit comes in the form of a dove *on* Jesus according to Matthew, *into* him according to Mark and the Ebionite Gospel : it rests *upon* him in the fourth Gospel ; it drives him after the baptism, as the three first Gospels say, almost forcibly, into the wilderness. Quite a special stress is laid on this blessing by the Spirit in the Gospel of the Nazarenes, which, in very recent form it is true, as it existed in the fourth century, thus related the Baptism : “ It came to pass when the Lord ascended out of the water, that the whole fountain of the Holy Ghost came down, rested over him, and said, ‘ My Son, in all the prophets I awaited thee, that thou shouldest come, and I might rest upon thee. For thou art my resting place, thou art my first-born son, that reignest for evermore.’ ”† The production of certainty in the mind of Jesus is indicated more or less by all the Gospels : according to Matthew and Mark the heavens were opened for Jesus ; according to Mark and Luke and the later Gospels, the voice of God was also addressed to him.‡ The hint to John and to the people lay chiefly with Matthew, but even with Mark, in the voice of God, which according to the former writer was uttered *concerning* Jesus, according to the latter spoke *to* him, and yet even so not merely *for* him, with Luke (and Justin) it lay besides in the heavenly token visible to all ; in the Ebionite Gospel (as in Justin) most of all

* Luke iii. 21 ff.

† Ap. Hier. Jesaj. 11, 1: factum est autem, quum ascendisset dominus de aqua, descendit fons omnis spir. sancti et requievit super eum et dixit illi : fili mi, in omnibus prophetis expectabam te, ut venires et requiescerem in te. Tu es enim requies mea, ut es filius meus primogenitus, qui regnas in sempiternum.

‡ Luke iii. 22. Mark i. 11: σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα. Whereas Matt. iii. 17 : οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀ., ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.

in the fire on the Jordan, which constrained the Baptist to fall at his feet.* According to the fourth Gospel, finally, it was only the Baptist that saw the token of the dove foretold him by God; but this, his token, becomes a token to all the people, when he now points with his finger to the Man of Spirit and of Blood, who is to be made known to Israel by the Man of Water.†

What now is historical in these histories? These great disparities which burst upon us, even before we wished to notice them are to begin with the greatest stumbling blocks of these stories. According to the three first Gospels John baptized Jesus, according to the fourth he did not baptize him. In the former a sign and voice were given, in the latter a sign only. In Matthew and Mark the signs took place with the exit of Jesus from the water, in Luke during his prayer after his exit; in Matthew and Mark the sign was only visible to Jesus, in John only to the Baptist, in Luke sensuously palpable to the whole people. In Matthew the voice that resounds is a speech from heaven *about* Jesus, in Mark and Luke an address *to* him. In Justin and the later Gospels the words of the address again are quite other than in our Gospels. According to those Gospels a twofold word was spoken with double initiation, and to the first sign the fire in the Jordan is added, with Justin, it is true, at the descent of Jesus into the Jordan, in the Ebionite Gospel at the ascent from the same, in the so-called preaching

* Luke iii. 22 : *σωματικῶς εἶδει*. Cf. Just. Tryph. 88. Mark i. 11, tells of the *φωνή* from heaven, as an objective one, *φ. ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν*, by which the view is set aside that it was only a voice for Jesus, a subjective experience. Why the gift at baptism is something objective too! That the voice is in the form of an address to Jesus, is a long way from being a proof for the former view, which were hardly established, had it been said, *φωνή αὐτῷ ἐγένετο* (cf. Matt. iii. 16) or *ἤκουσεν φωνήν* (Acts ix. 4. 7).

† John i. 32 ff. This representation that Jesus *φανερῶται* τῷ Ἰσραὴλ (i. 31) agrees verbally with the expectation of the Jews in Just. Dial. e. Tryph. 8: *μέχρις ἂν ἐλθὼν Ἡλίας χρίσῃ αὐτὸν καὶ φανερόν πᾶσι ποιήσῃ*. With John i. 29. 36. cf. ii. 6 ff. xix. 34. 1 John v. 6.

of Paul, during the baptism. Let us pass over as endless, the further variations of these recent sources.*

In modern times men have snatched now at one, now at another of these accounts, thinking by means of this elimination to get nearer to the original reality. To Schleiermacher and his many companions the account of John here as elsewhere commended itself as the most genuinely apostolic, and it is easy to see why: since after all this baptismal token made no difference to the accomplished greatness and dignity of Jesus, a token of recognition only for the Baptist, a wonder only for his eyes, and even for us a matter pretty much of indifference.

On the contrary with Holtzmann, Schenkel, Weizsäcker and even Lange the account of Mark has met with most favour; chiefly because here in opposition partly to Matthew, partly too to Luke, the incredible external occurrence appeared transformed into a wonder of the inner senses, hearing and seeing; the original element, for which it was thought the support of the fourth Gospel might also be claimed, as against later exaggeration and materialisation. Here it is only overlooked that the miraculous hearing with Mark is as objectively external for all as it is in Matthew, even though it appears clothed in the form of an address to Jesus, and admitting the wrong interpretation, it is still more forgotten that with visions, frequently as they may occur in the case both of the healthy and the diseased, especially of Orientals, a factor is introduced into the life of Jesus, which becomes more dangerous to him than external wonders, because to begin with the objection of Celsus is at hand "Who saw it besides thyself?" and still more because his restful, clear, and acute spiritual life nowhere betrays a trace of apparitions, and by belief in such, belief in him can only be shaken and paralyzed.† And were one readily in-

* Matt. iii. 16, 17. Mark i. 10, 11. Luke iii. 21, 22. John i. 32-34. The other Gospels in Anger.

† Cf. p. 281. Cels. ap. Orig. c. Cels. 1, 41: *λειτουργίᾳ σοι παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ*

clined to the opinion, that Jesus learnt chiefly here at the Jordan to believe in his divine Sonship, so as now, in a moment of highly strung spiritual feeling to hear and accept it, as it were, externally proclaimed from heaven, how can one believe in his case that his intercourse with God mirrored itself in childlike pictures of doves, and predominantly carried with it the destitute sense not of the possession of, but only of the longing for God's Spirit?

If then we desire to abide by the oldest account, there can indeed be no doubt that Matthew, and after him Mark, are far to be preferred to Luke with his materialities, and the account of John without them, yes, without any baptism or effect of baptism on the consciousness of Jesus: but are we seriously compelled to look for the accurate report in the vision of a dove and in the loud voice from heaven, whether rather intended for the people or for Jesus himself? Or shall we prefer with Paulus and Venturini, by a few additions and subtractions, distributed, it may be, with thorough impartiality among all the Gospels, to restore the historical balance? such as thundery weather, a sultry and oppressive air, lightning and thunder, gusts of wind, a flight of scared pigeons, and, after previous friendship, and a quiet grasp of hands, a consentient belief on the part of Baptist and Baptized in a voice from heaven? Or shall we go the length of Reimarus in assuming an understanding between the cousins, sham ignorance of each other, and fabricated visions? To be serious, let us only speak of the literal account of Matthew and Mark. Here it is easy to perceive that the vision of Jesus, even as represented by Matthew, contradicts altogether, as we have already seen, his spiritual perspicacity, and that spiritual opulence, which he already possesses, and according to the introductory stories of our Gospels themselves, owed not to a baptism, but to his birth:

φάσμα ὄρνιθος ἐξ ἀέρος λίγεις ἐπιπτῆναι. Τίς τοῦτο εἶδεν ἀξιόχρεως μάρτυς τὸ φάσμα ἢ τίς ἤκουσεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ φωνῆς εἰσποιούσης σε υἱὸν τῷ Θεῷ, πλὴν ὅτι σὺ φῆς, &c. Cf. Gesh. Ch. p. 79 f.

the audible voice from heaven, so incontrovertible and cogent a divine revelation, is at issue with the subsequent toilsome wrestling of Jesus, of the Baptist, and of the people, for the assured belief in his Messiahship: such as would have been spared them all in presence of such imperious and faith-compelling wonders. How wholly different indeed must have been the issue of the Baptist's deed by the Jordan had these wonders taken place: how must the heavenly light from above have broken through, and victoriously rent apart the twilight glimmerings and darkness of this spiritual questioning, searching and feeling, of which John and Jesus slowly and scarcely got the better, and to which the people succumbed.* On his knees, as the Gospel of the Ebionites relates, must John have worshipped; the hierarchs have bowed themselves before the Baptism and the Messiah "from above;" the people have led Him that was come by the sacred way of the wilderness to Jerusalem, and ceaselessly recalled as they gazed on John and Jesus the signs that had happened in the wilderness. On all this all history is silent, no signs accompanied the ministry of John; his Baptism, so say the Scribes, was not from heaven, his speedy arrest encounters no opposition, his imprisonment tells of no firm faith, and his successor steps quietly, unobserved by the people, indeed almost by himself, into the spiritual leadership, which lies already as a garb of purple on his shoulders by the Jordan; and points even the Baptist's doubt to signs not of the Jordan, but of Galilee.* These are the indications which history affords; not to touch the bold question, are there any such things as visible signs and audible voices from heaven: or even only the more modest inquiry, is it and was it ever the way of God, in the course of his spiritual world, above all upon the threshold of spiritual decisions affecting the fate of the world, and in contradiction to the wise economy of revelation pursued by his supreme ambassador himself, to take

* Matt. xi. 4 ff. Along with this see above, p. 257, and elsewhere.

away from seeking and finding souls the labour of deciding their own destiny ?*

Besides all this we find in these representations of the Gospels the traces of human thoughts belonging to the age. Of wondrous heavenly voices, a substitute, as was said, for the spirit of prophecy, as well as the accompaniment of divine indwellings, the later Jewish narratives are full to overflowing ; and even Hillel obtained the victory over Shammai and the Shammaites by means of the Bath-Kol, or "voice from on high."† Finally, it was only in keeping with Jewish views, even where concerned for the verbal fulfilment of prophetic vaticinations, that God could speak concerning Jesus according to the letter of Isaiah, or the second Psalm, or a mixture of both.‡ Again, it was a conception in the Spirit of the Old Testament, that the spiritual gift, which prophecy and the word of Isaiah itself had promised to the future and to the Messiah, should be expected in the form of an abrupt, sudden occurrence, such as would strike the eye, like the burst of a tempest, and that the advent of this gift of the Spirit should moreover be brought into some connexion with an ushering in of the Messiah by Elias, the ancient Man of the Spirit empowered to transfer it, the expected anointer of God's envoy, that is—in virtue of time and circumstance—with John, the new Elias, the Baptizer of Jesus.§

* Matt. xii. 39. 41. 1 Cor. i. 22, 23.

† Bab. Sanh. 11 : pro traditione habent, post mortem prophetarum ultimorum (Hagg. Zech. Mal.) discessisse sp. s. ab Israele, veruntamen eos exinde usos Bathkol. Particulars, Lightf. p. 275 f.

‡ Isa. xlii. 1. Ps. ii. 7. The passages in the Gospels are a mixture of both, whereas the extra-biblical quotations refer to Ps. ii. Matthew cleaves most strictly to Isaiah, only he has changed the servant, the chosen one, into the "Son," while Luke and Mark have borrowed the Son, and the form of address from Ps. ii. Compared with Luke and Mark, Matthew and the extra-biblical account are more original : they give the mixture pure and simple.

§ Cf. 1 Sam. x. 9 ff. xix. 23. 2 Kings ii. 9 ff. Also Matt. iv. 1. Acts ii. 2 ff. viii. 39. Just. Tryph. 8 : Χριστὸς εἰ καὶ γεγέννηται καὶ ἔστι πον, ἀγνωστὸς ἔστι —μέχρις ἂν ἔλθῃ ἡλίας χρίσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ φανερὸν πᾶσι ποιήσθαι. Cf. p. 231, n. Numberless appearances of Elias, Lightf. 276.

Again, it was for the Jews and perhaps the Samaritans that the dove, the favourite bird of God and man, that bird of sacrifice and Noachian messenger of salvation bearing the fruitful olive leaf, the bird of dignified flight, of shining wing, of bright and meaning glance, with its mysterious cooing, and most of all its prolific energy of nature and power of breeding, was the symbol of the Holy Spirit, or even of the Messiah; inso-much that the brooding of the Spirit over the waters of creation, as well as the wisdom of Solomon, was typified by the Rabbis in the shape of a dove.* And as for the fire that blazed up in the Jordan was it not the visible appearance of God's glory, and Revelation of Grace, which went with Moses as a pillar of fire across the sea and through the waste, and as a heavenly stream of fire, consumed the offerings of Moses, of Solomon, and of Elijah: expected by Isaiah as the Light of the Future; as a fire before which the rising water should seethe and hiss? †

Thus we doubt not but that here we have to look for sensuously strong and striking pictures of spiritual processes. We have only to ask were these spiritual processes accomplished here, by the Jordan, here, at this moment, or did legendary reminiscence take hold of facts, which belonged to the subsequent life of Jesus, which perhaps ran through the whole of his subsequent life superior to all special incidents, and unaffected by specialty of time, and relegating them to the commencement, to the single instant, so portray them? Or last of all, did the fact belong neither to a point of time, nor to the entire circle of the life of Jesus, but solely to the latter faith of the community: which believed in the Divine Revelation respecting the Messiah, because it believed in the Messiah himself?

* Targ. Cant. ii. 12: vox turturis vox spir. sancti. Bemidb. Rabb. 250: sedenti in solio sceptrum post eum appensum est, in cujus summitate erat columba et corona aurea erat in columba. Esra v. 26 f.: et ex omnibus creatis volatilibus (vocasti) tibi columbam unam. In the Midrash beresh. rabb. the Spirit, Gen. i. 2 = Messiah. Cf. also Meyer, Comm. Matth. Ch. iii. Oehler, Messiah, 437.

† Cf. Isa. lxiv. 2.

The last opinion we will leave to Bruno Bauer : the last but one to Strauss, in whose view the conception of his Messiahship entertained by Jesus matured at a later time : we have palpable indications that Jesus and John himself passed hours of highest solemnity even then by the Jordan, and that the Gospels, as Weisse, too, perceives, were right in their recollections, when they clothed the hallowing influence of those hours in the beautiful garb of these affecting pictures.

It might indeed be too much to maintain the round recognition of Jesus as Messiah by John. We should thus be burdening ourselves, even in this soberest form, with the old difficulties : we should not be able to make it intelligible how John could go on baptizing, how he could keep back from the people the proclamation of Jesus as the Messiah, how the people last of all could fail to seize with instant enthusiasm on the object of their fervent longings. The subsequent question from the prison :—which Strauss should not be the man to doubt : “ Art thou He that should come, or are we to look for another ? ” along with the reproachful answer of Jesus, lends, indeed, some colour to the two-fold and quite opposite assumption, that John recognized Jesus at the Jordan, either not at all, or in the fullest measure, and afterwards under the disappointment caused on the one hand by his imprisonment, and on the other by the noiselessness of Jesus’ activity, began again to doubt.* Looked at closer, however, this scene does not speak at all for the former alternative, and for the latter, at least, not altogether : for Jesus by no means reproaches John with having fallen away as a renegade from his own firm convictions ; far rather, with having untimely stood still in the development of his belief in Him that was to come ; a prophet of mere vaticination who disdains the fulfilment, the entrance into the promised land of God’s kingdom ; or whose eyes were veiled, so that he overlooked it when, as it were, on its very threshold. How

* *Gesch. Chr.* p. 79. Strauss, p. 404, finds *Matt.* iii. and xi. in clean contradiction.

could it else be said, the least in the kingdom of heaven, is greater than he, who does not enter in, yet since whose days the nation has been wrestling among itself for the entrance ; must it not rather have been worded, he who did enter in, and guiltily withdrew from it again.* Thus the sense of this remarkable deliverance concerning, and indeed rebuke of, John might perhaps be limited as follows against extravagant interpretation : John was in the full sense the final preacher, a very Elias, of repentance and prophecy : but that he never recognized the man to whom his prophecy pointed in the person of Jesus, that is his limitation, the barrier that hemmed his progress ; nay, in so far as the preaching and the deeds of Jesus presented him with the challenge of a sign, it is his fault, not, indeed, involving the guilt of an entire apostacy, yet a wilful kicking against the impressions which he could not but, and actually did, receive from the appearance of Jesus on the scene.

Nevertheless, the question and answer arising from this subsequent message of the Baptist compel us to another and a higher solution. If in the personal intercourse between the two men by the Jordan the question of the Messiahship was never broached, if at the sight of Jesus it received no light nor ventilation for the Baptist, his subsequent question implying his belief in the possible Messianic dignity of Jesus, implying that he gave to this possibility the precedence before any other, implying, therefore, a predominant conviction in its favour ; implying, moreover, a reverent appeal to Jesus himself, that he should decisively solve the question,—this question was so much of an inward progress, so mighty an acknowledgment for the dungeon, where all vision was shut out, so touchingly beautiful a subjection of the greatest among men besides to the person of Jesus, so decisively outstripping all Messianic faith of the people, and even the disciples of Jesus, at any rate:—that the answer of Jesus in its curt, abrupt severity, in its reproach, “Blessed is he whosoever is not offended in me,” could not but

* Matt. xi. 4-6. 11.

appear in truth as an excessive demand, a morbidly irritable exaggeration of his claims, in short, as a serious injustice. In order to suppress this charge against Jesus and his genuine utterance, there is but one way open to us : namely, the assumption that Jesus from what he saw at the Jordan, was entitled to take more for granted, and to expect more, in the case of John than from any one else : that the wilderness had witnessed, not indeed any formal homage paid by the Baptist to Jesus, but still an earnest outreaching of foreboding hope ; that accordingly the subsequent question of John, with its alternative, could only appear to Jesus, with instantaneous certainty, not as a sign of faith but of unbelief, as retrogression, as doubt, as " offence " or stumbling against better, higher impressions,—such as were not to be expected from the dungeon, dating not from to-day, or yesterday, but from the Jordan.

This mode of regarding the subsequent incident has at the same time its support in the events of the Jordan themselves. There is, no doubt, that John made the acquaintance of Jesus, and baptized him : will it be thought credible that the sharp-sighted prophet, who looked hierarchs and publicans through, was without grand impressions of a man who straightway afterwards became so mighty and illustrious, the talk of the whole land ? There is no doubt that Jesus was baptized by John otherwise than the rest of the multitude, the rite being hastily performed, without rebuke or exhortation, repentance, or confession : will it be assumed that the reflective searching mind of the Baptist glided over this name like any other without pause, deliberation, or discovery ? Deep may have been the inklings which thrilled the soul of the Baptist searching and anxiously looking out among all the candidates for baptism for the Messiah who, he doubted not, was near, even before the baptism of Jesus, when he formed acquaintance with him. Impressed by the humility, and at the same time determinate self-collectedness and sublimity of this very subjection, in view of the calm and joyous worshipper, who after the baptism, looking neither right nor left, laid his whole self before God,

the inkling which the Baptist had might well rise to an inward affirmation of his mind, which told him that of all the candidates he might reckon upon this or none as the Salvation that was to come. Especially, now that he had been forced to resign all thoughts of seeing the hope of the future appear from among the circle of the palaces or the dominant hierarchical classes and families at Jerusalem, it was no long leap for his mind, if, with the prophet-glance such as enabled Samuel of yore to discover the Great King in the Son of Jesse, —he inclined to behold in the obscure son of Joseph of Nazara, the chosen of the Lord. He could do so the more readily that he was from the first fain to count more on God than on Man, and because, moreover, he sought in his Messiah not so much a Prince of Power, as of Righteousness; and again, too, perhaps because after all the righteous one who stood before him, had some connexion with Davidic blood, the old hope of the prophets, and his own hope too, as far as it was conditioned by the peculiarity of his national picture of an earthly kingdom. It lay in the nature of an inkling and recognition so spiritually lofty, and so boldly transcending all sensuous experience that the Baptist did not at once decide, did not pay homage, nor preach it either, kept his thoughts to himself, waited yet once more for the finger of God; but as it is never given to man to deny the sun of inner life some faint outbreak of its beams, so the object of such close regard became himself in turn the fine observer, and parted from John with the impression that he was carrying away in his own person the hope and expectation of the Baptist. Thus, neither confessed to the other, as we might be quite sure in the outset in John's case, but none the less so on the side of Jesus considering the stillness and reserve that throughout pervaded his entrance on his work: yet so far had each gazed into the depths of the other's soul, that the one could subsequently put the straight question as to the Messiahship, the other answer it as straightly, and even in a tone of reproach.

But in still loftier and more certain sort than John's did the

self-certainty of Jesus celebrate the decisive hour. It is true that no history marks for us with documentary precision the moment of supreme self-recognition and resolve. We know with immediate certainty only thus much—that he by no means brought to the Jordan an assurance of his calling, a conviction of his Messiahship, such as Schleiermacher and Hase already presuppose upon its banks ; where he did not simply intend as one, complete in himself, to watch a rising movement, but to hear and learn from a prophet of divine authority : and in the second place we know that he did not remain with John, not even among the company of his disciples, but went his own ways, and shortly, nay, immediately afterwards arose as a new teacher of Israel, and more than that, as the Israel's Messiah. This fact, by itself, both allows and demands the supposition that the spiritual decision of Jesus took place at the Jordan. This supposition becomes all the more imperative, inasmuch as Jesus from the very commencement of his public appearance, rested assured of his Messianic dignity. For though at first he concealed this dignity, though at first just like John, he proclaimed only the near and not actually present Kingdom of Heaven, though he did not take the word Messiah or Christ, and Son of God upon his lips until later, yet it admits of no doubt, that from the beginning of his ministry he claimed a supreme authority for himself, and that even apart from the opening discourses of the first, second, third, and fourth Gospels, in which he at any rate proclaimed himself as the Messiah more or less openly, he according to the witness of all the Gospels, already in the demonstrably initial period of his activity, again and again bore the title of Son of Man, which recognizedly and undoubtedly, as will be shown anon, carried with it the implication of Messianic dignity. Now, although it would still remain possible to suppose that the resolve of Jesus that he was to be Messiah, was formed not exactly at the Jordan, but somewhat later, on his retirement into the wilderness, or better still, on his egress from the wilderness on hearing that the

Baptist had been laid violent hands on by the tetrarch Antipas, —in obedience to a sense of duty calling on him to take the place of the man of the nation, nay, fired amain, more mightily than ever, by the sacred longing for the Kingdom in face of the godless oppressors; yet it is at the outset clear, by what a mere span these points of time are parted, and in the second place, how very much the latter period is opposed to the testimony of all the Gospels. Still more certain is it, that the imprisonment of the Baptist, this startling breach in the hopes of Israel, rather paralyzed than provoked the Messianic resolve, and the quiet circumspect entrance of Jesus on his public career after that imprisonment had taken place, shows not a trace of that fanaticism, by which we should have to explain the Messianic resolve at such a moment. On the other hand all important indications speak unmistakeably for the Jordan, and led by these indications, as well as by the certainty of Jesus respecting his mission at the commencement of his work, we must decidedly set on one side the opinion of Strauss and Schenkel, that the notion of the Messiahship arose at a later time.

There are given to man moments of divine opportunity, furnished by heaven itself and the Providence on high for him and for the history of the world, in which all spiritual impressions, and all self-recognitions and resolves are concentrated for him, so that carried away beyond the chequered contradictory turmoil of all outward and inward images, he surveys himself simplified as it were along with the world around him, with one clear penetrating glance, and freed from all the petty brooding of considerations which the limits of human nature and the cares of individual life force upon him, pledges his word to the absolute divine necessity laid on him, that he will resolutely time his human pace to her gigantic march. This moment came for Jesus at the Jordan. There for him all the impressions of the age were concentrated in an infinite mirrored representation such as in truth had never before been offered to Israel. On the one hand the people, the whole people, as he

had never seen them assembled, in the misery of outward and of inward want, of which Judæa had still more to tell than Galilee, and yet beyond all faith and hope even of the prophet himself still capable of life down to the very dead, because still wrestling for life : on the other hand the veritable Elias of old, and more than that, the Prophet of the word full of wonders without wonders, the waker of the dead, who made Israel to walk, and the kingdom of God, by naming it, to move : and yet again but a yearning people after all, a waiting servant of God, to whom the last word was wanting, a kingdom of God in its members, but lacking Lord and Head, a movement without an aim, a mighty start without an issue, a sigh without a satisfaction, convulsive Messianic throes, but no glad birth of God. There Jesus collected himself as never before this to a sense of his obligation, and along with the obligation, to an act of self-recognition. In quiet hours and in quiet spots he had never forgotten his people, his claim upon his people, his people's claim upon himself : but the divine certainty, the imperious signal to arise, the divine necessity for which, sitting still in all the inwardness of his spiritual nature, he had waited, he was now for the first time enabled to read by means of the mighty action of the man of might in that writing as of fire whose flaming tongues curled upwards over the Jordan, standing in large characters visible, conspicuous, before his very eyes. What he saw and heard, could not but declare to him his mission, even if he only appeared as a spectator upon the scene ; his baptism made him expressly a living member of the community of God, and laid the task upon his shoulders to lend to the kingdom of God, to the service of God and righteousness the full measure of his strength, whether as subject, or as leader, as he could and as God would. He could but be the leader. The cup of misery was full ; the people had consecrated itself for the day of salvation, that day itself was dawning, all was present, only one was lacking, whom yet the poverty of the age could not supply for itself : the coming man must come ; like

the kingdom and the prophet who proclaimed the one as well as the other in words that could not deceive, in the name of God, himself cast the inquiring hopeful glance, which none other in Israel could attract and fix, on Jesus of Nazara. So Jesus seized on the belief in that destiny which fell to none, and yet to one: which God himself had sealed up in his birth in order to unseal it upon the Jordan. He found himself the man of the hour, the man of God because the people and God compelled him to take his own measurement, and because even the holiest and most exacting measurement revealed to him his competency to be a blessing to the world, a messenger and vicegerent of God. He assailed not the loftiness of the Baptist's mission by placing himself above him. John was still for him the interpreter of God, who had made not only Israel but himself meet for the kingdom of God, by bringing to maturity his belief in the dawning of the reign of righteousness, his belief in and love for Israel, his belief in his own destiny. But as the Baptist himself was conscious of his own limitations, and could not go forward to fulfilment, so Jesus knew that he by the will of God was more than the Baptist: that he could not only promise but give, assuage and satisfy, and in his gifts could far transcend the measure of the Baptist's expectations and the auguries of prophecy in its ancient Jewish garb.

So extraordinary and high-soaring a resolve, with which no other can be compared in the whole of history, the resolve to satisfy in his person all the unanswered questions, desires, prayers of the moment, of centuries, of millenniums, for which no man had ever arisen, to succour an enslaved nation, an ossified religion, a people that had beyond a doubt long been sinking into decay, to build for an utterly impoverished present not only tolerable conditions, but heights of happiness, such as in the boldest flights of spiritual opulence and depth had been conceived but not contrived by the noblest and most enlightened of thirty generations past, such a stupendous resolve provokes the thought of man so fond of levelling, and reducing

large figures to small, to seek for explanations by which the weight of such an enterprise may be brought down to the standard of our knowledge and performance, and the even measure of regular conventional humanity's short steps may be restored. One might try one's hand to begin with at shaking the Messianic design itself, and measure by the Jewish narrowness of this, in our world unreal, ideal, the human narrowness of him who could confess to such ideals. Yet this reproach will not hold: much as modern enlightenment down to Schleiermacher's time might scruple at this Jewish dream of the Messiah, it was the noblest spiritual ideal which the world, Greece included, has devised, and one which he could not disdain, who desired really to satisfy his own age in the first place, and in the second to realize the ideal of humanity in its loftiest traits; and, let us openly say it in defiance of little faith, actually could realize it. But perhaps it was after all not so hard, as we think in the present day, to attain the conviction of Messiahship. Other men, too, even lesser magnitudes in Israel, thought of being Messiahs. From the times of Augustus, most of all from the times of the emperor Claudius until those of the emperor Hadrian, there is a prolific stream of Jewish deliverers of their people, who partially at least grasped at the Messianic title. Excited Orientals, patriots incensed at the ill-treatment of the people did not stop long to consider the chasm between their ideals and their personality. Yet this retort is mere levity: an over-hasty and unsuccessful Messiahship is to begin with not capable of comparison with that Messiahship which kept its word, and kept its stand: and then the retirement of Jesus into the wilderness, and the quietude of his appearance in public, and the hallowed restfulness and clearness and spirituality of his work are the sheer opposite of all sanguine headlong haste and all cholericly tempestuous uproar. On the other hand we may admit that the moving impression of the Jordan scene compelling a clear quick "Yes," facilitated the resolve of Jesus: still more the

hallowed spirituality of the fundamental tone of John's expectations concerning the kingdom, as well as that of the people, and transcendently of the prophets themselves. To become a ruler of the people with sceptre and sword—for that Jesus was not prepared, even if his Davidic origin might have encouraged him to assure for even these Old Testament pictures a literal and yet higher fulfilment. But prominently as such views may have risen to confront him from the pages of the prophets, and the spirit of the age itself, which dreamed of a Jewish ruler of the world, yet already with Isaiah they found their complement and idealization in the expectation of a Leader and Prince of Piety, Knowledge, and Righteousness, and most of all the later times since Zechariah and Malachi, the last of the old prophets, had thought more of a servant of God, a priest, and a prophet, who according to the words of Moses, should come like unto himself; of an Elijah and a Jeremiah, than of an earthly ruler.* Characteristically enough men expected in the time of the sword-wielding Hasmoneans after Mattathias, Judas, Jonathan, and Simon, a final salvation by means of the trusty prophet whom God should wake up, and sought the glory of the victorious John Hyrcanus in a union of the prophetic and priestly office with the principedom: characteristically enough the people found by the Jordan in the man of prophetic garb and word the deliverer of the nation, and afterwards staked their hopes on Jesus himself as the new Elias or Jeremiah or John.† Even the Talmud, under the influence, though it be, of the lessons taught by endless times of humiliation and suffering, is not without the picture of a Messiah, who sitting at the gate as himself the "Leper," binds up the wounds of the wretched and the sick, until that "To Day" shall appear, when at last he may

* Vol. I. § III. Cf. Isa. ix. 6, 7. xi. 2. xlii. 1 ff. lxi. 1 ff. Zech. vi. 12 f. ix. 9. Mal. iv. 5. Sirach xlviii. 10. 1 Macc. xiv. 41 f. (Deut. xviii. 15). Matt. xvi. 14. xxi. 26. John i. 21. vi. 14. vii. 40.

† Hyrcanus Jos. B. J. 1, 2, 8. Again the people's judgment concerning Jesus, Matt. xvi. 13, 14.

come in all his greatness as the Saviour of the converted people.*

Palpable enough is the aid which these views of the Man of the future in their superior affinity to the whole consciousness of Jesus must have rendered to his spirit in its soliloquy and inward wrestling with the massive conception of the Messianic ideal: palpable, too, the aid rendered by the expectation of a human and humanly descended Messiah, one hidden until his appearance before the world, growing from small beginnings, capable of suffering, and actually suffering, or at least compassionately healing the wounds of sufferers—to scruples which in view of the humanity, nay, the lowliness of his own origin and the entire manner of his life, might have barred themselves in spite of Davidic pedigrees against the assumption of the Messianic position: if, as in subsequent times, a miraculously born Messiah, or even one coming down out of the clouds of heaven from a celestial existence, to reign in glory, was expected.† Even so the transference of the mightiest and hardest of the acts of the future to God, as in particular the very common relegation of the judgment of the world to a period before or after the divine Messianic age, was at all events a sensible facilitation of the undertaking of functions and

* Cf. Lightf. 308: *nomen ejus leprosus e domo Rabbi. Vir aerumuarum*: according to Isa. liii. One is also reminded of the name Menahem = Comforter (Isa. xl. 1.) Lightf. 257. Oehler, 438.

† Just. Tryph. 49: *πάντες ἡμεῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων προσδοκῶμεν γενήσεσθαι*. This expectation agrees with Deut. xviii. 15. Isa. vii. 14. Zech. vi. 12, and see Rev. xii. 5, 17. The concealment of the Messiah, cf. John vii. 14. Further beside the passages in the history of John, p. 254 f. see Enoch xlvi. 6: he was chosen and hidden before him, before the world was made. Similarly the Samarit. legend of the Messiah: he walks now already on the earth, yet without knowing it himself. Petermann A. Samariter, Herzog xiii. 373. Cf. Dan. iv. 14: *ἐξουθένωμα ἀνθρώπων ἀναστήσει ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλ. τῶν ἀνθρώπων*. Without wonders, Lightf. 25. On the capacity for suffering and the passion of the Messiah we shall have to speak below with reference to the Galilaean Messiah and the death of Jesus. Cf. meanwhile Just. Tryph. 89: *παθητὸν τὸν Χριστὸν ὅτι αἱ γραφαὶ κηρύσσουσιν φανερόν ἐστι*. The Jew Trypho himself says this; only he will have no accursed cross. Cf. Acts xxvi. 23.

duties which seemed to transcend the measure of humanity.* With all these facilitations of the resolve, the resolve itself was not reduced in scale: even such a Christ as was invoked by yearning thousands, even the human Christ, even the Christ as figured by prophecy, none could be, who did not feel the power to amalgamate in his living person the very loftiest Old Testament expectations, its glorious kings, and resuscitated prophets; who could not deal forth such satisfaction to the earthly spirit-world as had never been heard of nor experienced, and who did not carry within him the incontrovertible witness of power and resources that could reach and avail for all. And what if, in addition, we speak of Galilæan quickness and determination in its most blameless form? It could but serve to secure that a dignity, which carried with it the most indubitable credentials, did not delay its self-proclamation, fraught with salvation for the world, by a grievously over-anxious hesitation.

Without an external miraculous token we stand here in presence of the performance, and beneath the influence, of the highest spiritual wonder, which just because it is spiritual is a worthy crown to the whole work of 'John, and the whole growth of Jesus. Even as John visibly derived his mission, not from external signs, but by dint of determination from the depths of his soul, so Jesus won and conquered his Messiahship, not by a sealed diploma, but through sharp inward conflict, and the converse of his spirit with all the signs of the times: doubtless through a wrestling of the spirit, so much the loftier, as it meant more to be not only the pioneer of the Messiah, but the Messiah himself. Only in one point have we from the first abstained from denying the diploma from on high: the threads of the spiritual process in the Baptist as

* Cf. Bertholdt 206 ff. Colani 28, 41, 60 ff. Hereafter to be discussed more in detail. Cf. Esdr. vii. 28 ff. where the death of the Messiah is followed (after 400 years) by the judgment of God. For the Baptist, however, judgment and Messiahship are simultaneous, the Messiah himself the executor of the Judgment. Matt. iii. 7, 11-12.

well as in Jesus were not only wound off in the course of human consciousness ; they reached to heaven.

What they believed they could not venture to believe without assurance of the will of God. To this counselling, acting, and determining God who sends them, all their sayings, especially the sayings of Jesus recur ; our historical conscience compels us to confess that they acted from this conviction, and our intellect does not rebel against the acknowledgment, that they acted not from erroneous conviction, but that divine institutions and rays of enlightenment brooded over the Jordan, and that a divine beckoning and a divine sway must have accompanied the greatest deed and the greatest crisis in the history of mankind. But this conviction : it is the will of God ! did not exclude, notwithstanding, either previous or even subsequent conflicts of soul : out of inward conflict it flowered forth, and inward conflicts it challenged for the time to come, just because as a signless, immaterial fact grasped by pure spiritual intuition it might again itself be subjected to vacillations of the striving, doubting, human spirit, and in every great crisis of the life of Jesus, in which his Messiah seemed to fall along with himself as forsaken by God, was actually so subjected. It is patent indeed upon the face of the history of Jesus, what need there was for time and courage, until his Messiahship, the silent reflexion of his soul, grew into an avowal. What need of strength to hold his great faith fast and fortify it against the denials of unfaith ! What need of sunbeams of success and words of belief from his disciples, in order to turn the inward conquest into the impregnable enjoyment of a glad possession !* In truth an outward sign was found again and again to be the slightest and faintest legitimation and glorification of Jesus : his truly divine and human glory and greatness first breaks upon us in its entirety, when the Messiah's diadem, which decks his head, has grown out of the birth-throes of a spirit striving unto blood amid the calling and luring of God and of the world.

* Cf. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 82. N.

II.—THE RETIREMENT OF JESUS.

It is in the highest degree probable that Jesus immediately after his baptism left John and the Jordan, whether, as the Synoptics relate, to betake himself to the wilderness, or as John indicates, to journey towards Galilee. The three first Gospels, to begin with them, take notice of this immediate departure from the scene of the baptism under the forcible compulsion of the Spirit, and tradition, as represented by Justin Martyr, and even the Valentinian Gnostics, have followed in their footsteps.*

Besides, it cannot be ignored that the impulse of freedom and independence, the contemplative tendency, and finally, the sacred baptismal vow and the Messianic resolve, to which Jesus had just attained, would counsel a retirement from John and the vast and turbulent popular assembly, most of all his retirement into the neighbouring wilderness. Especially the belief he had won in his own Messiahship would preclude the possibility of his remaining a looker-on at and listener to the activity of the Baptist: he must, if he stayed, give him his discharge, and himself lay hold of the people. This he did not do and could not do, less on the Baptist's account, who without any firm decision respecting the Messiah, went on baptizing—than on his own, because he could not and would not as yet proclaim aloud the secret of his soul, nay, because he had need of assuring himself yet more thoroughly in God's sight of that which he had attained.

On the other hand the fourth Gospel, it is true, makes the Baptism of Jesus, or rather the heavenly vision of the Baptist concerning the person of Jesus when he presented himself, succeeded at all events by no instantaneous retirement.

In the threefold series of days, with which the appearance of

* Matt. iv. 1. Luke iv. 1. Mark i. 12. John i. 44. Just. Tryph. 103. Exc. ex Theodot. Val. 85 in Anger.

Jesus on the scene here opens, the first day shows us the embassy from Jerusalem before the Baptist, along with the hidden presence of Jesus; the second, the vision of the Baptist regarding the approaching Jesus, and his proclamation before the assembled people; the third, the handing over of his disciples by John to Jesus, the spiritual fascination of these disciples by the Messiah whom they themselves now already recognized; the fourth, the increase of the number of the disciples and of these followers' faith, and the departure for Galilee, up to the arrival at the wedding in Cana on the sixth day.*

But fair and full of meaning as this description sounds, showing as it does in all earnest the discharge of the Baptist by his greater successor—historically it cannot after all be accepted, even though Renan grounds upon it all his untenable divinations—neither in the account of the first two days, as we saw already, nor in that of the following. Full of meaning we call especially the touching consignment of John's disciples to Jesus, added to from day to day, the still and majestic reserve of Jesus, who takes nothing from John, save what he is willing to give, and what comes of its own accord: then the impression made by Jesus on the disciples purely by the greatness of his person.

And yet how could Jesus continue to remain in the wilderness, only passing backwards and forward at some distance from John? Have we not here a pale unsubstantial shadow of his baptismal act, a lifeless and pompous anticipation of results, a mere promenade display, which with all its humility courts a following?

And John and his disciples? John is supposed on the third day to have pointed two of the disciples who stood round him to the passing Jesus with the words, "Behold the Lamb of God!" a word which indeed as early as the second day he is made to have already uttered at the first approach of Jesus in

* John i. 19—ii. 1.

the fuller form, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." With these words the "baptizer with water," we are to believe, had after Isaiah pointed to the bloody death of the Servant of God who had now appeared ; but we must say not only that a prevision, that was wanting to Jesus himself, is still harder to assume in the case of the Baptist, and moreover that the whole earlier Jewish belief concerning the Messiah, even the belief of the disciples of Jesus, even the belief of Jesus himself, could not brook this *via dolorosa* for the Messiah, at all, or only with the greatest difficulty, as it came in the course of history, but still more that the Baptist with his expectation of the Strong One, the Mighty One, the fiery restorer of order in Israel, finally with his subsequent dismay at the path of humility, not to speak of the path of suffering, which the Messiah trod, was quite inaccessible to the thought of a suffering Messiah.* Thus then he cannot have spoken of Jesus as the Lamb of God, in the character of a prophet whose flight outstripped and put to shame himself and Jesus and the entire age. The two disciples, one of them Andrew, the other only hinted at but in all likelihood John, are said now to have followed Jesus, to have spent the evening from six o'clock with him, then to have announced the Messiah to their friends beginning with Andrew's intimation to his brother Simon. On the fourth day likewise Philip the fellow-countryman of these brethren of Bethsaida, is said to have been summoned by Jesus to follow him, and to have drawn Nathanael after him. The real history shows that these callings and followings did not take place until afterwards in Galilee ; and still more does it show that the recognitions of Jesus as the Messiah occurred only after a long, long intercourse with him, towards the end of his ministry. And Jesus himself ! At the first sight of Simon, without seeing as yet a vestige of his faith, he designates him

* Cf. p. 281. The theories of later Judæism, p. 296. Details under the thoughts of Jesus on his passion.

with Godlike foresight the rock (Cephas, Peter), he greets the mocker at Nazara, Nathanael, as an Israelite indeed in whom is no guile, and upon his wondering question how he came by his acquaintance with him, he points out to him—thus wresting from him the confession that he is the Son of God, the King of Israel—the-fig tree under which he was standing or sitting before the call of Philip, and sets before him for the future the prospect of beholding yet greater things, the heavens opened and angels descending and ascending on the Son of Man. Not to speak of lesser matters, of dwellings and fig-trees in the desert; the most certain fact in the history of Jesus, is that it was at quite another time, much later, after his act of faith in confessing the Messiah by the springs of the Jordan in uppermost Galilee that he called Simon the Rock, Peter; and again that he drew his disciples into following him not by mighty signs, but by his simple word, demanding moral decisions; finally, that Godlike omniscience was wanting to his life on earth. Thus we are conscientiously compelled to let this whole entrance scene in the Messiahship fall as matter of history. Here we have the later narration of a time, which would no longer brook the humbly human beginnings of Jesus, and would transplant to the scene of his first appearance that glory of nature, knowledge and resource, which historically marked only his final exit and exaltation. It is only the same halo of radiance in another form, in which the older Gospels set his birth and those who witnessed it: the work of an impatiently hastening, and therefore backward glancing view, which desired to behold the child, and still more, if like John it declined to speak of the human poverty of his childish years—the man as entered on his career, in the same light as that in which the eye of faith in all ages presents to itself his grandeur as that of the succourer, deliverer, Lord and Saviour of history. Doubtless the three first Gospels too, leave questions to be asked. In these for instance the retreat into the wilderness stands in immediate connexion with the

story of the temptation, which, in itself, gives room for doubts, —and then again transfers this to the desert retreat which is only the defeat of the temptation.

With Matthew Jesus is driven by the Spirit into the wilderness just for the purpose of being tempted. The desert was indeed the appropriate place of temptation according to the early pattern of ancient history: it was not only the abode of privation, but in popular belief also of demons.* It has even, though without ground, been conjectured that in early tradition the story of the temptations was localized at the Jordan, and only afterwards artificially transferred to the desert realm with which it was most in keeping.†

In spite of this threatening connexion the retreat of Jesus may be held to: first because it is so entirely in his manner as exhibited in the retreats of his subsequent life, and had its ground in the significant act, which he had now completed, as well also as because the unhistorical character of the story of the temptation cannot after all be so absolutely maintained. This retirement is not to be thought of as one brought to pass as it were against his will by the forcible action of the Spirit, as the three Gospels make it appear, Luke indeed so much so that Jesus is driven about by the Spirit in the wilderness; but as the free act of his will, under excitement, and yet certainly with clear perception of what he did.‡ The spot is not named; Luke is thinking of the wilderness on the way home: with this the tradition in some sort agrees, which discovers this desert to the north of Jericho by the desolate rugged wall of rock formed by the mountain chain of "The Forty Days,"

* Deut. viii. 2. Lev. xvi. 10. Isa. xiii. 21. Matt. xii. 43, and elsewhere.

† Meyer's Comm. Matt. ch. iv. founded on Just. Tryph. 103: *καὶ γὰρ οὗτος ὁ διάβολος ἤμα τῷ ἀναβῆναι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Ἰ.—προσελθὼν αὐτῷ καὶ πειράζων*. . . . This representation seems simply to be a compendious, or at any rate not the original one.

‡ Hase, p. 107: it is possible that Jesus retired into a wilderness according to the precedents of his spiritual ancestors, in order on the eve of decision once more to think over his life in communion with God.

(Quarantana, Jebel Kerentel).* The length of stay can only be conjecturally defined by weeks: the forty days of the Gospels are too visibly a number of Old Testament significance, recurring elsewhere in the New, and there is no use in abridging this number with Krabbe, or lengthening it with Weisse.†

Strictly taken the Gospels do not even pronounce explicitly anything about the entire length of the stay, but only about the length of time during which Jesus fasted, or was tempted. What Jesus thought, and sought in the wilderness, the Gospels have at least hinted. He stands like Moses on Sinai in still converse with God, by whose word he lives, but he is at the same time put to the test by Satan: and it is this side of his sojourn which has been most industriously portrayed. We can only suppose that he was engaged by prayer and meditation in briefly preparing himself once more for his work, and spite of the legendary statements of the Gospels we may agree with them in thinking it probable, that he overleapt the demands of appetite, which the wilderness itself curtailed, in his devotion to God, nay, with the aim of intensifying that devotion. Here to some extent he fell in with the Baptist's manner of life: only we must not forget the great distinction that the fasting which he afterwards so curtly dismissed, never became for him, as for John, a regular practice, and a form of religious activity valuable in itself, but at most was the natural accompaniment of unusual moments of spiritual life. Wholly wrong were it to go so far as to believe, that Jesus went into the wilderness with the positive object of imitating the asceticism of John, to some extent, as Renan thinks, retrograding from his better self.‡

* Luke iv. 1 f. Jos. B. J. 4, 8, 2: ψιλὸν ὑπέρκειται καὶ ἄκαρπον ὄρος μήκιστον.

† Cf. Exod. xxiv. 18. xxxiv. 28. Deut. viii. 2. ix. 9. 1 Kings xix. 8. Krabbe, p. 167. Weisse 1, 283.

‡ Traces of fasting are certainly rare in the life of Jesus. In Matt. xvii. 21

It was natural that the cogitations of Jesus in the wilderness should serve to bring into strong relief the consciousness of the difficulties of his undertaking, and the right method of completing it.

That Jesus was tempted in the wilderness, is affirmed by three Gospels, while the fourth presents us in regard to it with a silence that says more than words. It is true the fourth Gospel too knows of temptations for Jesus, though not under that name, conflicts of Jesus with himself and with Satan especially at the approach of his catastrophe.* Yet have these temptations nothing of the depth nor the sanguinary earnest of the temptations of the earlier Gospels, as in particular that of Gethsemane, which is wholly wanting in John. They are but momentary clouds, which only appear, in order to be the more triumphantly and gloriously broken through by the sun of his nature and his will, to such a degree, that the Godlike hero on the threshold of his Passion, (in splendid confutation of the Cerinthian distinctions of Christ from Jesus the suffering man) has no need at all to calm and comfort himself, but only his disciples.†

Hence we may also explain the absence of the story of the temptation by the peculiarity of the fourth Gospel's picture of Christ, and by the inability of this writer to conceive of the energy of the Son of God's divine consciousness as if it were subject to suffering and languishing in toilsome strife.

Thoroughly intentional too is his substitution of a marriage in the cheerful Galilee for the gloom of the desert, of a measureless bounty of bestowal for necessitous want, of a transcendent power of knowledge and performance for suffering and temptation—as the first mighty effulgence of divine glory.‡

the mention of fasting is wanting in the oldest MSS. That he did not absolutely reject fasting is shown by Matt. vi. 16-18. ix. 15. Details of this question later.

* Cf. xii. 27.

† Ch. xiii.-xvii. Cf. Vol. I. on the Gospel of John. Its dogmatic character; and age.

‡ John ii. 1 ff.

But even in the three Gospels there are very remarkable variations; not only in respect of particularity and the details of the narrative of the temptation, but in its entire spirit as well. According to Matthew Jesus at the outset like a second Moses spent forty days of religious observance in the wilderness; then the armed Man of God was met by a short spell of temptation, such as the people and its leader withstood so ill in the days of yore: according to Luke and Mark even the forty days are no divine Sabbaths, but long days of strenuous conflict and (according to the Clementines) of disputation, like the forty years of temptation which befel the people in the desert, whose defects the true Holy Branch of Israel was to change into victory and triumph.* Both pictures are attractive, that of the New Moses and that of the New People of God, as whose Leader Jesus appears.

We might perhaps be tempted to look for the older form of narration in Luke and Mark, because the glorification retires into the background, and the conflict is set in relief: under closer scrutiny both betray the one-sidedness and lateness of their representation, inasmuch as the fasting of Jesus and the forty days of fasting of which Luke himself too speaks, plainly refer to the precedent of Moses, which is fitting before Matthew's eyes, and inasmuch as the change of the forty days' religious fasting of which Matthew speaks into forty days' temptation with its three short sharp assaults of Satan, which Luke as well as Matthew holds fast and which could at most be distributed over three days, is involved in a manifest contradiction, and is accordingly a merely artificial transformation.† Without doubt this representation of a forty days' conflict, as it is found in these two writers, proceeded not

* Clem. Hom. 19, 2: ὁμολογεῖ (ὁ διδάσκαλος) ἐπὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας διαλεχθέντα (τὸν πονηρὸν) πεπειρακέναι αὐτόν. Cf. Luke iv. 2. Mark i. 13. On the other hand, Matt. iv. 2 ff.

† Cf. the repeated Holy Days of Moses. Exod. xxiv. 18. xxxiv. 28. Deut. ix. 9, 25. x. 10.

simply from a disregard of one part of the Old Testament precedent, originally underlying the narrative, but also from a dark view, especially intensified in Luke's Ebionite source, of the power of the demoniacal empire, which is found elsewhere in these writers, as well as from a belief in the overpowering and divinely miraculous might of the Messiah, who was able in a conflict, that lasted not three days only but forty, to withstand the sallies of hell.

So dark and gloomy a view we should neither be able to perpetuate, nor even to ascribe to the sun-bright mind of Jesus, and least of all could we surrender him himself to languish in such a bloody succession of constant conflicts with Satan, in place of enjoying converse with God.

This observation with regard to Luke and Matthew opens the way to a second striking difference among the three Gospels, which indeed has only too often ere now been quite wrongly explained. We refer to the fact that in some sense Matthew and Luke again unite in opposing Mark. While the former plastically portray a series of collisions between the two representatives of Good and Evil respectively, Mark disposes of the whole huge catastrophe in two lines :—" And he was forty days in the wilderness tempted of Satan, and was with the wild beasts, and the angels ministered to him." It is impossible to assume with so many vigorous champions of Mark's account, that here we may put our finger upon the simple original form of the story of the temptation : for this narrative supplies essentially the entire framework of that story, presupposing already the rich contents of the other Gospels, unless we are to believe, that the legend produced the skeleton first, and flesh and blood afterwards : nay, by the mention of the beasts, among whom Jesus sojourned, the given network is extended beyond its original state, and enriched with a new and most luxuriant adjunct. Besides this abridgment is so dark and obscure in its result, that neither could the other Evangelists have built their well-defined accounts upon it, nor are we at this

present in a position without the light of the two others to get any sense out of Mark's words. What we wonder, have the beasts, expounded by interpreters now diabolically, now paradisiacally, to do with Satan or the angels? do they threaten, or do they minister? * Is Jesus at one and the same time threatened by Devil and beasts, and served by angels, or, first one and then the other? If the former be the case did Jesus then contend? If the latter, did he deserve the ministration of the angels, since the account really tells us only of a struggle on the part of Satan, not of a struggle and victory on the part of Jesus. And why too the ministration, if after all there is no fasting? Now we have a right to interpret Mark by Matthew and Luke, but we have also the task of explaining his variation and curtailment. If we are right in rejecting the theory that Mark was not concerned to relate in detail a well-known story because on this ground he would have been justified in saving himself the trouble of many another recital, the explanation that best commends itself is surely the appeal to the intention which in Mark, as in Luke, underlay the narrative at the outset. If the object was to portray by the story the fearful nature of the devilish assault, then the impression of this onset could not but be heightened by the addition of a bevy of beasts from the desert, if the object was still more, in keeping with the specific tendency of Mark's Gospel, to set forth the glory of the Messiah, it was enough, in truth a preliminary step towards the fourth Gospel, to indicate the beginning and end of the temptation, and directly serviceable to the end in view to represent the hero and conqueror not in the stress of conflict with those painful impressions of exposure to violence, suffering and danger, which are awakened by the three scenes of conflict

* Strangely enough Baur with Bengel and Olshausen supposed an intended analogy with Adam in Paradise (Gen. i. 23. ii. 19). Instead of satellites of Satan, others contented themselves with beholding a plastic depiction of the horrors of the wild. But the diabolic significance will not be called in question in view of Lev. xvi. 8, 10. Num. xxi. 6. Isa. xiii. 21. xxxiv. 14. Matt. viii. 31. xii. 43.

presented by the two other Gospels. The fuller accounts of Matthew and Luke agree in the main. Yet that of Luke is the later; he shows at the outset the contradiction, above affirmed, in greater abruptness, betrays in detail more colouring, and has unluckily placed first the temptation on the mountain, which was plainly both as regards its offer and its demand the last and most extreme, because the Jewish Christian writer sought for the climax of the temptation not in the character of the procedure but in the locality, not in the height of human audacity in its denial of a God but in the Temple-height of the holy city.* If we make Matthew our foundation the course of the temptation is as follows.† Satan, with full clear consciousness how dangerous an adversary he was, appears to Jesus, most likely in human shape, assails him three times according to the familiar Hebrew number of perfection, and seeks to disarm him or to win him over. By quoting texts, by addressing him, though only conditionally, as the Son of God, he seeks partly to lower his divine consciousness and consciousness of divine Sonship, partly to stimulate it to precipitancy. The first temptation lay nearest: the hunger of the desert, the whole poverty of Jesus' life was a cry for bread, standing in contradiction to the belief in an exalted station: natural resources failed, but had not God in the wilderness supernaturally produced bread for Israel, had not John but now declared with strong assurance that God could raise up his people from the desert stones? Thus the way was marked for encouraging Jesus, to be himself the creative God or Son of God, nay one that should create bread to satisfy even sensual selfish desire: "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread!" Jesus discerns the connexion

* The demand for worship by the Devil in Matthew in the third, in Luke in the second Temptation is obviously the point where matters must come to a breach: but with Luke they do not come to a breach, because he narrates herewith only the second Temptation. The ampler painting is seen, *e.g.* in Luke iv. 2. v. 6.

† Cf. especially Ullmann, *Sinlessness of Jesus*, 7th 1863, Ed. 113 ff. and 2nd Excurs.: the various modes of viewing the Story of the Temptation, p. 241 ff.

of this temptation with one of those which beset Israel in the wild, where the hungry people murmured against God, yet learnt with shame God's means of preservation.* He may not interfere with God's government either by murmuring or desiring or commanding; therefore he takes on his lips the text of Moses in reply to Satan, the word of human lowliness and human trust towards the God who blessed with the boon of manna: "Man liveth not by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God:" whether he is here thinking rather of a deed of deliverance on God's part in case of the last extremity of bodily want, or rather of the sustaining power of the word of God, in face of which bodily hunger along with all provocations to self-help in earthly things shall give way.† The second temptation consists in the magical transference of Jesus from Jericho to Jerusalem, a distance of at least seven leagues,—and to the flat roof of the Temple's edifice, with the challenge to cast himself into the yawning depth trusting to the succour of God's angel according to the words of Psalm xci. 11, 12. The enemy is cunning, he desires self-deification no longer, but the belief in God, in which he had just met his rebuff; he tries his hand no longer on the carnal appetite, but on ambition; he purges even ambition of selfish taint, for it is no personal, but a theocratic miracle, and at the same time a test of the protection God would extend to his own ambassador, and an ostensible miracle of display by which the faith of Israel might be gained for God's messenger—that he flings into the soul of Jesus. Jesus replies again with a saying of Moses, a word of warning addressed to the congregation in the wilderness, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God," (Deut. vi. 16). Even the belief in God, even the theocratic aim, he would say, is never to be abused to eccentric demands upon divine performance, nor to attempts to suspend

* Exod. xvi. 3 ff. and Deut. viii. 3. The first temptation of the wilderness this, however, was not (against Strauss), but the second. Cf. Exod. xv. 23.

† Matt. iv. 4. Deut. viii. 3. Cf. John iv. 31 ff.

the natural order of human destiny, or threats to break with a tarrying Deity.* Satan is forced to cast about him for his third onset; but he can only do so by throwing off all disguise and deception, now that these had failed to reach their object, yet only by also neutralizing the deterrent impression of his nude ungodliness and enmity to God by means of the mightiest and most fearful assault upon the frail weakness of human nature, which consists in offering the greatest of prizes, and that without any danger from without. Led up to a high mountain commanding a view of the whole world, (we know not where to look for it), Jesus receives the tender of all the kingdoms of the world, but subject to one condition, that of paying homage to the Devil as the world's monarch. The thought of a heathen monarchy of the world lay apparently far from any temptation which could address itself to the Messiah, inasmuch as the latter had to seek his territory not there, but in an Israelitic theocracy; so far only it touched upon it, as the Jewish expectation of the Messiah did not after all exclude the notion of a Government (not heathen indeed, but Jewish) of the world. Yet it may still be an open question whether the universal heathen monarchy of the Devil, with its means at once of gratification and destruction, would be offered to the Jewish Messiah as such, or simply to the ambition of an individual so capable alike of the heathen or Jewish career.† But even this

* The dispute as to voluntary going or a forcible carrying away of Jesus is yet surely terminated at Matt. iv. 5: that as to the sense of *πτερύγιον* (roof or wing) by the fundamental conception which demands the highest and holiest part of the Temple's space, as well as by the meaning of *πτέρυξ* = that which covers. Finally the reasons against the spectacular nature of the portent in Ullmann, p. 245, are altogether weak. The Temple court was notoriously always frequented, and without this object the undertaking as a mere private experiment would be quite senseless. The yawning depth by the Temple hill, Ant. 15, 11, 3. With the journey through the air with the Devil cf. that with the Holy Ghost, Vol. I. Christian sources outside the New Testament.

† As to the belief in a diabolical possession of the world (for which the way is paved in Daniel), cf. Bertholdt, *Christol. Judæor. Jesu apostolorumque ætate*, Erlang. 1811, p. 183 (R. Menah. comm. in Gen.): dixit Sammael ad Jehovam: super omnes mundi gentes dominium mihi dedisti, sed super Israelitas non dedisti

temptation Jesus smites down with a word of Moses, careless of the offer, and indignant at the demand, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve" (Deut. vi. 13); he now clearly recognizes Satan and calling him by name, bids him begone. The conclusion of the temptation is crowned by divine honour; not self-sought, but sent of God, angels minister to him; sustenance, not self-wrought but divine, comforts him: here is a greater than Elijah, the legitimate and approved Messiah.* That by his conquest over each temptation, and by his divine exaltation he had not outgrown all temptation for the time to come, Luke has added less in order to save the human character of Jesus' life, than in order to exhibit anew the terrible earnest of the utter and appalling contrast, which at the outset he established between Messiah and Satan.†

It is at first sight one of the most difficult tasks, in face of such narratives, to maintain one's faith in any real history of events in the wilderness. Magnificent, and profound in meaning as the fundamental conceptions of this pictorial world present themselves even to the belief of modern thought; the temptations of the Evil One addressed to the bearer of Israel's and mankind's nobility, for the purpose of impelling him under colour in the first instance of faith in God and communion with God to every form of rebellion against God and His established ordinances in the realm of Nature and of Spirit, and finally of

mihi dominium. Other passages, pp. 183-186. Similarly as in these passages Satan appears in the New Testament as the *κοσμοκράτωρ* of heathendom. Cf. 1 Cor. x. 20. 2 Cor. iv. 4. Eph. vi. 12. John xii. 31. Rev. xiii. 1 ff. Only people are always far too ready to suppose a Messianic external rule (even over the heathen who are to be taken from Satan, says Meyer) and even to use Jesus for the refutation of this thought. The latter is not in question at all, for Jesus primarily repels only the Devil, not every kind of dominion, and the dominion offered is not simply and solely any kind of outward rule, but the world outside Israel, whether Satan offered this *κόσμος* as such by itself, or in addition to the gift of Israel.

* Cf. 1 Kings xix. 5 ff.

† Luke iv. 13: *συντελέσας πάντα πειρασμὸν—ἄχρι καιροῦ*.

seducing him to the sheer abyss of apostacy, yet at the same time to the dizziest height of devilish world-supremacy vying with God himself,—yet no less phantastically monstrous is the entire form, the living flesh of these stories.

Bodily apparitions of the Devil, humanly masked; aerial flights of the mighty one, forcible compulsion of his victims, nay of the whole world, which finds its supreme ruler in the Devil; then again a visible apparition and ministering attendance of the Angel world, to hold such features fast, is in the power only of the coarsest faith, whose representatives we will not name, but not of that of a finer texture, not even of the faith of Olshausen, Lange, Bleek, Ullmann. The single acts of the drama, too, surely do not correspond either to the proverbial cunning of the Wicked One, who must have known the dignity of Him with whom he had to deal, and yet bethought himself of seductions, which would have been no seductions even to a weaker nature, and which only took from step to step a less seductive shape: nor do they answer to the spiritual and moral stature of Jesus, who must have recognised Satan at the outset without waiting for the third assault, and have sent him about his business. Attempts have accordingly been made to read in the story a corrupted rendering of historical events.* Either with modern "Enlightenment" and Rationalism human tempters have been thought of under the figure of Satan, such as Priests, Pharisees, deputies of the Sanhedrim, perhaps (as Lange supposes) the same who appeared before the Baptist, and who wished to induce Jesus to espouse a political Messiahship, or waiving the hypothesis of any bodily living and moving personalities—an inner process in the soul of Jesus has been assumed, a vision (Origen), a dream (Paulus), or a course of reflexion busied among the pictures of the people's and the world's imagination; on which supposition the choice still lay open, of ascribing the whispered suggestions

* Cf. together with the Commentaries, especially Ullmann, loc. cit. p. 251 ff.

either solely to the popular and worldly spirit (Bleek), or to its final impersonation the Devil, who was at all events invisibly present (Olshausen, Krabbe, Ullmann.)* It must be owned that both theories might well appear arbitrary when compared with the narrative as it stands, the latter class especially open to exception and formidable to the last degree in their bearing on the soundness, perspicacity and purity of the spiritual and moral character of Jesus. Hence Schleiermacher, who has many followers, came to adopt the theory of a didactic discourse addressed by Jesus to his disciples, a parable concerning the meaning of the Messiahship, as he understood it, and as they were to proclaim it: after which the original sense was subsequently misunderstood as though it had been an experience of Jesus.† This theory, it must be confessed, is almost the weakest of the lot. The story is wanting from the very outset in all the conditions of a parable, since Jesus could not have introduced either himself or Satan, as a sensuous type of a supersensuous fact, but only as the fact itself, and hence as the aim, meaning, and interpretation of the type. This story is wanting, even if it was a parable, in all the simplicity, naturalness, and sobriety of the Master of Parables. This parabolic story is finally not saved from the reproach that Jesus spite of all the pictorial characters of his tale, yet was portraying more or less actual occurrences in the domain of his inner experience, and in consequence must have cherished exactly those reflexions which offend us, and which Schleiermacher wanted to evade. Hence accordingly Theile would

* Strangest of all is Venturini's account of the matter: the Tempter is Zadok, the ally of Judas Galilæus, who in conjunction with the Sanhedrim intends either to win or destroy Jesus, and in the third temptation actually announces himself to him as the Devil. Pity that Zadok lived a generation earlier.

† Schleiermacher, *Krit. Versuch über die Schriften des Lukas*, 1817, p. 54 ff. Similarly A. Schweizer, *Kritik des Gegensatzes zwischen Rational. u. Supranat. u. Exeg. Hist. Darstellung der Versuchungs-Gesch.* 1833. Also Usteri, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek, Hase. The majority, as Schweizer, Usteri, Hase, have subsequently modified their opinion. Bleek kept to his first view. *Synops.* I. 198.

prefer to imagine "some follower," instead of Jesus himself, as the author of the warning against earthly Messianic hopes.* Thus indeed the easier road was already completely reached of openly avowing a denial of the historical character of this perplexing history, and assigning its production to the ideal fancy and creative invention of the later Church in regard to Jesus, instead of to Jesus himself, as, taking their departure from Schleiermacher, Usteri, De Wette, and most of all Strauss, have actually done. According to the mythical view, then, as chiefly represented by Strauss in his first *Life of Jesus*, a pious consciousness, fraught with Old Testament conceptions, sought to rediscover, and hence to reportray in a higher form, the great trials of the people in the desert, and of the heroes of piety, Abraham, David, and Job, in the picture of the manifested Messiah, the Chief of the Righteous, the representative of the people. According to Bruno Bauer again it was the consciousness of the Christian community that found expression in these pictures, shrinking in recoil from the precipice of the Christian principle, the sheer breach with reality, the principle of miracles and the end of the world.† Without doubt the explanation of this story should have been sought neither so far earlier as with Strauss, nor so far later as with Bruno Bauer, inasmuch as it is much more natural, as Usteri and De Wette saw from the first, and as Strauss is now more inclined to insist, to derive this whole fabric of narrative from the reigning conceptions of the time with respect to the relation in which the Messiah stood to the kingdom of Satan. The New Testament is full of the view, that the Messiah has to fight the conflict with Satan, and in this conflict to conquer. It finds here a point of contact with the later Jewish theology, which makes Satan take fright at the aspect of the Messiah, who is to cast him and all the heathen

* Theile, zur Biogr. Jesu, p. 49.

† Usteri, Theol. Stud. 1832, p. 779 ff. De Wette, Comm., Strauss, L. J. 1st Ed. 417 ff. New L. J. 391 ff. Br. Bauer. Kr. d. Ev. Gesch. d. Synopt. 1841, I. 240 ff. Cf. Hase, p. 106.

into hell.* This conflict was assigned by Jewish and Christian theology, (see Paul and John in the Revelation) chiefly to the end of all things, but at the same time with equal right to the first appearance of the Messiah upon earth.† Taking its stand upon the Ebionite source, the Gospel of Luke, and afterwards John too, for instance, brought the death of Jesus into connexion with an assault of Satan, and to this chiefly refers the closing words of Luke in the narrative before us, "Satan left him for a season."‡ In addition to Luke, Mark, and in some measure Matthew, also relates at least this much, that the Messiah from the first assumption of his office put the devils to flight.§ What was more natural, especially since the Jewish theology also recognized temptations of the Messiah by Satan, than to place in the van of all other conflicts which accompanied the course of his life, and its end, and the end of all things, this decisive and fundamental combat, of which all else was but the result and the consummation, and to fill up the outlines of this combat with pictures from the Old Testament? ||

Such a view has its points of support; and yet the question arises, whether the narrative is therefore to be credited with no threads of connexion at all with actual occurrences in this most important crisis of Jesus' history? In spite of every doubt with regard to every feature in this recital even Hase, Weisse, and of late A. Schweizer, have kept this question open.¶ In the first place, we may note that the belief of the people in a

* Pesikta in Jalkut Schimoni, Bertholdt, p. 185: the Devil as Lord of the World (Sar haolam Sanh. f. 94), seeing the light under God's throne is affrighted: sane hic est Messias qui me et omnes gentiles in infernum praecepitatus est. Nez. Isr. ante initia regni sui erit bellum Gog et Magog, etc. Cf. the idea of Antichrist and Armillus, p. 69, 201.

† Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 6. vi. 2 f. xv. 24 ff. 2 Cor. iv. 4. 2 Thess. iii. 3 ff. Rev. xx. 2 ff.

‡ Luke xxii. 3, 31. John xii. 31. xiii. 27.

§ Luke iv. 33 ff. Mark i. 23, &c. Matt. viii. 28 ff. xiii. 39.

|| Pesikta in Schöttgen 2, 538: ait Satan: domine permitte me tentare Messiam et ejus generationem.

¶ Cf. A. Schweizer, Pred. V. Samml. p. 94: his own account of the struggle which he had actually and really fought, but, as is his wont, in symbolical form.

worldly Power, full of enmity to God, and fraught with destruction to man, whose germs are deeply rooted in the soil of the Old Testament, and whose vigorous development since the times of the Captivity in Inner Asia was brought under the influences of contact with Parseism was by no means strange to Jesus himself. One cannot possibly regard all the sayings of Jesus in this department as later interpolations, much as they might have been exaggerated in the more recent Gospels, or actually indulge in fancies about accommodations on Jesus' part to the mode of thought and expression current among his people, as did Rationalism. The power of evil in the world was embodied for Jesus, as afterwards for his Church, in personal potentates above the world and ruling over it, in a Satan and a kingdom of Satan, of which the detailed conception is to be developed in the teaching of Jesus.*

Jesus regards himself as engaged in conflict with this kingdom of Satan, from whose might he not only wrested those who were possessed, but sinners as well, while again Satan in his operations appeared to him to employ all his power and artifice in order to hold fast his victims in despite of him, yes, in order to compass the downfall of himself and his disciples, as the later Gospels depict in strongest colours in connexion with his decease at Jerusalem.† But even in the oldest sources he teaches his disciples to pray to God for deliverance from Satan; he sees in Peter, who would talk him out of his thoughts of suffering, a godless Satan in human shape: he shows to himself and his disciples the threatening temptation of human weakness, and at the same hour, at least according

* This doctrine is weighty enough, especially with regard to the question concerning the sublimity of Jesus' view of the world, which spontaneously attaches itself thereto. We regard (let us remark by anticipation) this question as to the existence of an evil power as one scientifically quite open. Only on one point can a really animated contest arise, whether the assumption of demoniacal possessions does not rest upon too great a confusion of dogmatic and medical points of view.

† Cf. Matt. xii. 22 ff. xiii. 25 ff. Luke xxii. 3. 31. John xii. 31, xiii. 27, xiv. 30, xvi. 11.

to Luke, casts his glance back on the temptations which had beset his life on earth, by which, according to all indications, he understood not divine but diabolic temptations.*

These facts in the consciousness of Jesus, which are to be explained simply and solely by his serious view of the world, and the keen self-inspection involved in his moral freedom, and its genuinely human struggles, allow us at the outset to suppose that the story of the temptation did not merely proceed from later Jewish conceptions of the Messiahship, but that in spite of all the typical and symbolic phraseology of the narrators arose from correct reminiscences of the community with respect to the historical course of the life of its Lord.

We may leave it an open question whether this story, so full of pictorial detail, intended to portray the life of the Lord in its entirety, so fraught with temptations as it was, or, as Hase supposes, the story of the formation of his character in youth ; or finally, an actual moment of signal earnest, immediately before his entrance on his public career ; but certainly, we have abundant ground for proceeding to this last assumption, which assures for the substance of the tale the largest historical validity, and perhaps may even win for its form a somewhat greater measure of confidence. If the mighty subsequent crises in the life of Jesus ; his resolution, formed in Galilee, to suffer ; his entrance into Jerusalem to meet that fate, and, it may well be, Golgotha with its words of anguish—were actually encompassed with sore trials, is it likely that the so transcendently decisive commencement of his mission should have remained free from temptation, or that Jesus, who was never entirely silent in presence of his disciples concerning his great experiences, the proofs of his own belief, would have kept entirely buried in the depths of his own soul this decisive

* Matt. vi. 13. xvi. 23. xxvi. 41. Luke xxii. 28. That Jesus taught a Devil is warmly espoused : Cl. Hom. 19, 2.

initial triumph?*

In point of fact the historical indications supplied by the life of Jesus conspire here with all the probabilities of psychological estimate and valuation to secure for this detail of the ovangelic story of the Temptation, notwithstanding all eccentricities in its elaboration, a sound historical kernel. It was the fact and the nature of the Messianic calling which imposed upon the soul of Jesus a burden of questions, doubts, and struggles, the more clearly and calmly he considered, the more narrowly he scrutinized the resolve which he had so fervidly espoused by the Jordan. The determination to be a Messiah at all was a challenge to every kind of faintheartedness which besets mankind, such as is wont to rise in revolt against a stupendous task, and against the heroic resolutions of the loftiest spiritual life proudly exalted in aspiring flight above all considerations and calculations of the future. It was indeed not the question asked by the instinct of self-preservation in face of an undertaking fraught with peril and of incalculable extent which rose in the front rank within the soul of Jesus: the man who forgot humanity to think of God, and in whose subsequent teaching the losing of one's life appeared a fundamental law of God's kingdom, was a stranger to the egotism of self-preservation, whether under the fair name of the necessity for spiritually enjoying to the full the bounteous universe of his God, or under the fine title of the duties of God's kingdom which awaited him. Why, even in death, it was only severance from his calling and disciples, not himself that he thought of in the first place; and the genuinely human shudder which he felt beneath the shadow of dissolution, first in Gethsemane and Golgotha, did but flit across his countenance as the price which must needs be paid for immortality. Urgently, however, did the question rise to face him, whether his strength would avail. He stood the only man among the people, confronting spiritual and worldly

* Cf. on such communications to his disciples Matt. xi. 25 ff. xii. 25 ff. xxvi. 38.

powers, confronting a people, which by all the voices of the ancient covenant, from Moses to the last of the prophets, was accused of lukewarmness, indolence, stiff-neckedness, and whose sudden awakening might again be quenched like fire in the straw, and yield to the capricious humour, the peevishness, and blunted sensibility which in Galilee especially had been so often experienced !

The weak man of flesh and blood as leader of God's kingdom against the lord of the kingdom of evil, armed and backed by the hosts of destruction !—the wrestling champion of virtue toilsomely mastering himself, for whom sin had its solicitation, even though he had always overcome it,—was to be a destroyer of sin, a hallower and restorer of the people, an ambassador and vicegerent of God ! And granted *that* it was to be, how was it to be ? Spite of all the plenitude of prophecy, the way was not marked out for the Messiah. Here there were pictures of kings and here of prophets, here divine wonders, here human deeds and acts of self-denial : even the immediate present, even the people in the wilderness, even the Baptist, had not solved nor thrown light upon these multifarious contrasts. Which way was Jesus after all to go ? and what just now more natural for him, than in brooding over the question *whether* his strength sufficed, at the question *how* this should be so, to draw back from being the prophet that he would and could have been, and swayed by caution, by anxiety, and a sense of powerlessness, leave to God the field to be fought, and the word to be spoken ?

Now, that popular Jewish notions of, or lust for, sceptre and crown and sword should have roused any lively emotion in the breast of Jesus, whether we suppose a spark of ambition, or a wish to save himself the toils and sacrifices involved in the prophetic office, is a thought that we must flatly repudiate ; we should have to renounce all higher conception of the religious nature of Jesus, and his first idea of the Messiah, if we would credit him with desires which were beneath his level, and

which he could not have understood. We could sooner believe, that it was just from the conflict of his own with the popular Messiahship, that his inward struggle arose. Dare he assume an office which, up to the time when John gathered his crowds around him, had always been otherwise expected and understood among the people, and which by pressure from beneath, such as he saw at work in opposition to the Baptist, would perhaps forcibly assume a different form under his own hands, or which, if he only followed his own principles, exposed him to the danger of witnessing the religious movement in Israel from the Baptist down to the people, languish, grow cold, and retrograde, offended as it were at his person, and himself, alone and deserted, beholding his conscious integrity as a spiritual deliverer of the nation bitterly disappointed and cruelly sacrificed to the indifference, and scorn, it might be even the hatred, of the people? Yes, it was in this form alone, in the conscientious estimate of cause and effect, of the stake at issue and the possibilities of success, of what he could do, and how it would be received, that the political Messiahship could engage him, though only for half a moment, without a serious struggle, without any uncertainty, without any inward distraction, for being what he was he could not consult the people, but only obey God, and he could give no salvation save only that which was spiritual, as it lived in his own soul, and could sooner bear to see all the people fall away from him (as actually happened in the end) than become untrue to himself and the call of God within him. But in a totally different manner from the political Messiahship might he be troubled in this last hour by the far deeper and at the same time genuinely religious and genuinely Israelitish question, in which ultimately all scruples as to fact and method, as to personal competence, and circumstantial conditions, as to the true divine form which the kingdom should take, found their issue: is the kingdom of the Messiah to be built up by human deeds, or by the arm of God, and divinely miraculous means?

It was the feeling of weakness, especially on the threshold of action, which so often claims our attention in this holy life, and it was the spirit and the express predictions of the Old Testament, which might commend to Jesus in this final moment of collected deliberation, the attitude of human reserve, the expectation of heavenly signs of fire and tempestuous displays of power; or counsel their invocation. Was it not possible to God, was it not for the honour of his cause, to smite down with a breath of his mouth the adversaries of that sacred cause, heathen and hierarchs, sinners with their sins, and lead the nation as one man to the Messiah, and the Messiah to the nation? That such considerations may probably have been at work we are compelled to believe, in addition to all other points which support our judgment, by the infinite faith which Jesus actually had in the ultimate sole action of divine omnipotence, his scorn of the operations of flesh and blood, to which he reckoned himself as belonging, and all the consequent caution and hesitation which so strikingly mark the commencement of his career, and the reflexions he demonstrably cherished down to the very goal of his history concerning legions of succour from the sky, which might deliver the Messiah from suffering, and in case of his coming again accompany him to victory against all the resistance of the world.* It is at once apparent, how very nearly the pictures of the tale of temptation, scarcely so wholly unhistorical, touch upon such processes within the soul of Jesus: for the thought that underlies them is really the invocation of supernatural means on behalf of the Messiahship, which natural means apparently availed not to realize.† And now it was just here that Jesus triumphed over all the bulwarks of human faint-heartedness so plausibly dressed out with the

* Cf. Matt. xxvi. 53. xvi. 27. xiii. 40 ff. The belief in divine omnipotence (xix. 26). See Part ii. § 3.

† The communication by Jesus to his disciples was probably on the whole confined to that mentioned on next page.

strongest religious faith: without external miracles divinely wrought and without waiting and begging 'for wonders for friend and foe, he decided yet once again, and once for all, a genuine human hero without equal, for the mightiest vocation with the smallest appearances, the slightest beginnings; he decided for human performance, prophetic humility, for the obscure every-day method of the word, uncertain of success and of the future, of the final thoughts and designs of God, certain only that God and the world desired this word, and that God's wonders if they should burst forth, must follow the same.

That therefore was in all its aspects the grand result in fine of his quiet, brooding deliberation in the desert, namely, that he held to the great thought of the enterprize undertaken at the Jordan: he ended with an increase of assurance that he might come in the name of God: nor fear his task, the enemy, the people, nor himself. That his decision was a hard one we shall believe beforehand in view of the gravity of the issue and his own earnestness: but all indications lead to the conclusion, that the inner conflict of such a mind gained its sharpest edge from the vivid realisation of the enmity of the hostile ruler, nay from a personal wrestling between him and Jesus. That realisation is guaranteed by the demonstrable conviction of Jesus that as Messiah he was the appointed adversary of the empire of Satan: the personal nature of the strife, by his entire subsequent view of temptation and most of all by the significance of the actual utterance, in which he sets forth the opposition between the two kingdoms and their respective rulers.* This memorable utterance is neither more nor less than a fresh and final corroboration, with which none other may compare, of the story of the temptation both generally

* Matt. xii. 25 ff., Luke xi. 17 ff. Weizsäcker too, *Unters.* p. 330. has found this passage worthy of remark, but has brought forward nothing cogent on behalf of its reference to the story of the temptation. Unhappy and exegetically quite untenable is the reference of Luke x. 18 to the same by Lange, *L. J.* II. 1070 f.

and in detail. Here Jesus plainly designated his contention with the empire of Satan as a personal one, partly as a conquering invasion of this empire, especially in the expulsion of devils from those who were possessed, and partly as a binding and mastering of the ruler himself, which anticipates all special conquests as the chief decisive battle which determined all the triumphs and acquisitions of the entire campaign. When was this chief battle of Jesus, which precedes all lesser victories won by his operations? One might, particularly in view of the highly symbolic mode of expression, reflect on the whole past of Jesus' life, in which from stage to stage of his advancing years he had given no place to the evil one, and approved himself as the invincible warrior and therefore as the victor in face of his allurements and his threats. But it is clear, that the utterance does not permit us to entertain the thought of his youth, but solely of his entrance upon his ministry. For in the name of a kingdom Jesus had assailed the other kingdom, and the decisive stroke against the ruler was followed according to a deliberate plan of rapid assault by the attack upon the subordinate powers of that kingdom.

It was then the incipient Messiah that smote Satan, and who, merely for the sake of differing from the Gospels would look for this victory in the commencement in Galilee or in Capernaum, where Jesus was already engaged in following up his advantage, while all indications point to a previous stupendous trial, belonging not to the carrying out but to the undertaking of the Messianic enterprise at the Jordan, where the tempter, "the Strong One," with his allurements and his threats had been routed and put to flight?

Offence is wont to be taken at the temptation of Jesus. Well it may be, in face of the traditional representation, the coarse envelopment of profound truth. But the question is, is every form of the theory thus open to objection? Suppose to start with we take the undeniable belief of Jesus in Satanic operation and temptation in the sphere of the human spirit, and

transform this in consonance with the culture of the age, from something external to humanity, into a link in the mysterious process which takes place within the human soul : our opinion of the higher God-consciousness of Jesus would be far from being lowered by this hypothesis, admitting that he could only interpret the dark, fateful and subtle opposition which arises in the human breast in conformity with the Psychology of his time, as the interference of an alien power, especially as his soul might experience a two-fold inclination to relegate to the realm of an alien dynasty the diabolical animus in humanity at large, and the strange upstarting of enticement within. For we shall always hold fast to the position that the creative element in him is his person, and his personal fundamental religious tone, not the whole sphere of his speculative thought, with which he stood amidst the surroundings of his age, most of all in questions like that concerning the Devil, on which the stress of his independent thought could not possibly fall, and in which his reflexion was far from bearing the immediate stamp of his fundamental feeling, as it did in respect of his faith in God. Yet one might become more apprehensive for the pre-supposed nobility of his spirit, on finding traces of impious rebellion in his soul, and that in such force, that he himself could speak of conflicts and temptations, nay, of Satanic onslaughts. In that case the difficulty remains much the same whether we think with Jesus himself of a devilish power from without, or with the culture of our age only of self-produced motions of sinful allurements from within. For the external power would need after all, in order to gain a footing in the man, a human susceptibility and a human indulgence as well : the inward generation on the other hand does not after all derive its vitality from the personal activity of the human self alone, but also from the incentives which fall upon the soul of the individual from the world and its surroundings, so that both here and there is a coincidence of inward and outward operation going to produce the shadow that overcasts the soul.

But, to be candid, these difficulties cannot trouble him, who finds at the outset a triumphant issue to this and every temptation in the life of Jesus ; nay, from whom this life in its entirety compels the loud unqualified confession, that it was indeed a life of human conflict, yet a sinless life, and only in this sense a life of Messianic pretensions and performance. Resting in the recognition of this fundamental fact, one may venture without dismay to accept the moral conflicts of Jesus in a more serious, *i.e.*, in a more real and historical sense than is usually done. It is a sorry and almost cravenly evasive explanation of these struggles, to limit them with excessive solicitude either to ideas and fancies, which coming solely from without, from Satan or the world, mirrored themselves in the mind of Jesus, or to sensations of appetition or aversion arising in his soul, without for a moment laying hold of, determining, or even affecting his will. For to say nothing further of the first fine distinction, a mere image of fancy, which does not seize or captivate the will, but as it arises, is extinguished as something that does not belong to the man, like a mere optical delusion, and an appetition which begets in the inmost man, in his will, no emotion, and no conspiring sympathy, no desire of pursuit or performance, but as soon as it stirs within, is suddenly and of necessity banished again forthwith, this will never bring about an oppressive deadlock, will never deserve the name of a struggle, a temptation, or even, to use Ullmann's own language, a "strong agitation of the feelings."* Besides it is plainly enough discernible that the historical conflicts which Jesus underwent, did proceed to the length of touching his will, of a seduction of that will to a standstill, to a turning away from the Messiahship. And only *thus* was he from the struggles of his youth onwards down to Gethsemane a man like ourselves, in birth, as well as in

* In such unsatisfactory definitions and saving clauses does Ullmann's exposition twist and turn throughout, *Sündlosigkeit* 7th. Ed. p. 114, 116, 118, 259. And yet, p. 259, it lies in the nature of this fact, that the mind of Jesus must also have been strongly engaged.

capacity, although we, apart from his victory as compared with our defeat, distinguish him from ourselves in this, that by reason of the goodness of his nature, the allurements which beset him was a lesser one, and by reason of the greatness of his task, his performance a greater, yes, another than our own. But, what is of most weight—his temptation in the wilderness is of quite a peculiar kind, it had but very little to do with human provocatives to sin such as perhaps were not wanting to his youth. What he called, and felt to be, evil, was as we should reckon it, something good, not merely mediocre, only not the highest good, and in his stern reckoning an evil. Why, it was not a lust for possession, for enjoyment, for power, that he felt, in truth not even the genuinely human instinct of self-preservation, but essentially the truly moral conscientious consideration of the requirements and divine obligations of this office of his, and the touching lowliness which caused him to mistrust his ability. We call these virtues, we call them sacred considerations, entitled to existence, and which are only bound to be sunk when overshadowed by a supreme behest. He reckoned so sternly with himself, that the holiest deliberation became for him a sin against the first call of God in his soul, and that he, as afterwards, when confronted by Peter, saw only before him the infinite alternatives of the divine and the human, nay, of the divine and the diabolical; and warned off the moral pleadings of his conscience as a lure of the Devil, as soon as he seized their contrast to the voice that was deepest of all. When thus viewed, the story of his temptation is a new gem in his holy development, not only because he conquered, but because the inexorable godlike loftiness of his judgment discovered the Devil in scruples, which even the noblest would have fondled as spiritual pearls.

This rigorism, which brooks no bending and no twisting, which presses straight forward, knows but one thing, and rejects all else, comes to rest in God's highest heaven of ideality alone, though all mankind may tremble and be scat-

tered to dust upon the ground beneath, lies like a godlike glory on the whole life of Jesus, most of all on the history of the temptation.

This rigorism was the splendour, but also the power—speaking humanly—the happiness of this life. Where final issues come to such clear expression, grow so pointed and so sharp, that only God or the Devil and the world are left, human life advances in performance beyond deliberation to deeds. Thus in the wilderness the choice of Jesus was complete, when on the right hand stood God, on the left the mystery of apostacy. He could no longer hearken to objections; the fiend he left in the desert: led by the hand of God and of the holy angels, he stepped forth after this second consecration, to meet an expectant mankind.

THIRD SECTION.—THE PROPHET IN PRISON, THE MESSIAH IN GALILEE.

I.—JOHN AT MACHÆRUS.

On issuing from the wilderness Jesus was suddenly waylaid by the terrible tidings that the Baptist had been delivered into prison. It is true that among our earlier Gospels it is only Matthew's which contains a clear and definite statement to this effect, while Luke mentions the catastrophe that befel the Baptist quite incidentally in immediate connexion with the baptism, without any accurate measurement of time; and Mark, although, like Matthew, he introduces it just after the story of the temptation, does not at any rate mark the immediate succession of the events, viz., the temptation, the arrest of the Baptist, and the return of Jesus to Galilee. For by a severely rigid reckoning one might certainly make out that Mark by no

means excludes a longer period of activity for the Baptist, and a longer stay of Jesus in these parts even after the events of the temptation. But what is of most weight is that the indefiniteness of its associates derives satisfactory light from the definiteness of the first Gospel without any conflict between them; that further, Matthew and Mark are so far quite in harmony that they place the captivity of John both as to time and cause before the retirement of Jesus into Galilee, as also are Matthew and Luke, in so far as they completely exclude any interval of time or occurrence between the end of the temptation and the return of Jesus to Galilee. If, however, we would assume with a kind of impartial distrust at once of the three, and the fourth Gospel, that the out-and-out resignation of John in favour of the ministry of Jesus, *i.e.* his imprisonment was itself but a natural though unhistorical piece of pragmatism on the part of the earlier Gospels, it may be answered, that these Gospels, faithful as they were at all events to tradition, do not even involuntarily betray the slightest trace of any continuation of the Baptist's ministry after the public appearance of Jesus, that the utterances of Jesus moreover without exception designate the rising that took place under John, as broken off and past, and that finally the tragic retreat of the Prophet of the Kingdom was the sole adequate motive for the unhesitating, courageous advance of Jesus to the front.*

Now an interval of time and occurrences is doubtless assumed (an assumption perhaps not altogether unoccasioned by the indefinite statements of Mark) in the fourth Gospel, inasmuch as Jesus on leaving the Jordan, after a flying excursion to the wedding in Galilee, is still at work simultaneously with, or alongside of John on Judæan territory, until the latter, with solemn farewell asseverations as one who was decreasing, retires from the arena before Him who was increasing.†

* Matt. iv. 12. Luke iv. 14. Cf. iii. 19-20. Mark i. 14.

† ii. 1. 12. 13. iii. 22-36. iv. 1-3.

When we come to the appearance of Jesus in Galilee, it will be the proper place to judge of this divergence in respect of the locality with more completeness : at present the conjecture forces itself upon us, that this new co-ordination of Jesus and the Baptist, for which the Evangelist makes room by the remark, "for John was not yet cast into prison," (iii. 24) without on that account censuring the older Gospels, belongs essentially to the representation of the author alone, namely as an artistic completion of the introductory scenes, which this Gospel sought to picture from the beginning, without rigid regard to history. The ministry of the Baptist here literally winds up to the last thread, inasmuch as Jesus finally takes both baptism and people out of his hands. But what Jesus does is at the same time the destiny of the Baptist, yes, his own will. His disciples are jealous of the candidate that was, to whom men are flocking under their eyes, while John's place of baptism is deserted. Here John is once more quite himself, a head higher than all of them, the man without selfishness, the man of the will of God. "He must increase, I must decrease," for he is Christ, he is the Bridegroom, he is from above, the eye-and-ear witness of heaven, the dispenser of life and death, the beloved Son, into whose hands the Father hath given all things.* Thus the Baptist leaves the arena for the prison : his sun may go down, the "little light," as Jesus himself, not very probably, is made to say of him, for the new and greater Sun is there, and the setting one greeted the rising one with its last majestic beams. The scene is grand, but not strictly historical. It is not likely in itself that Jesus worked side by side with the Baptist and the Baptist with Jesus. It is not likely that Jesus then or ever baptized ; it is not likely that the Baptist spoke of Jesus so as to express views which entirely and completely coincide with the demonstrable and loftiest opinions of the late Evangelist. Add to this the contradiction to the other Gospels, with which there is agree-

* John iii. 22-36.

ment only to this extent: that even this Gospel cannot deny that John retired to the silence of the prison at the commencement of Jesus' ministry.*

His imprisonment John owed immediately to the prince in whose land he had sought for freedom and undisturbed activity—Herod Antipas. On this point the three Gospels are at one with Josephus. On the other hand the Jewish Toledoth indulge the dream that John as a follower of Jesus was slain with the sword by Herod the Great, while Jesus with the rest of his companions found shelter in the town and wilderness of Ai.† There is disagreement among the former authorities in their account of the motive for the arrest. According to the Gospels the reason lay in the Baptist's disapproval of the illegal marriage of Antipas with Herodias: according to Josephus the blow of Antipas was directed against the Messianic agitation. Herod, as Josephus relates, fearing that the spread of the Baptist's popularity might lead to some sort of revolt—for the people seemed to be ready to follow his counsel to any lengths—he judged it far better to anticipate any attempt at disturbance which might proceed from him and to kill him, rather than have to deplore the catastrophe when the revolution had once set in.‡ One may feel doubtful, which

* A side-by-side co-operation would after all but involve the splitting up of the Messianic movement, an encroachment on the one hand upon the standing of the greatest of the prophets, on the other upon that of the foreboded Messiah. The little transient light, John v. 35. Cf. on the other hand, Matt. xi. 9 ff. Jesus no Baptist, see under Johannine points of view, Vol. I. The Gospel of John: its dogmatic character.

† Toled. ed. Hnldr. p. 42 ff. This Ai is intended doubtless for the long resisting Canaanitish Ain destroyed by Joshua, whose king Joshua hung up until the evening (Josh. vii. 2-8, 29), in the neighbourhood of Bethel, in the direction of the Samaritan Sichem. (Cf. Josh. viii. 30 ff.) Later it was again rebuilt. Cf. Winer, Ai. Hnldriens would identify Ai with Capernaum. In the Toledoth Ai is the seat of the Christian apostasy until the death of Jesus and afterwards. Are we on the strength of this narrative to believe in Aenon near Salim and Sam. ? p. 233, 261.

‡ Matt. xiv. 3 f. Mark vi. 17 f. Luke iii. 19 f. Jos. Ant. xviii. 5, 2: δέισας Ἡρώδης τὸ ἐπὶ τοσόνδε πιθανὸν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μὴ ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει τινὶ φίροι, πάντα γὰρ ἐψέκσαν συμβουλῇ τῇ ἐκείνου πράζοντες, πολὺ κρείττον

is to be preferred of the two accounts, one of which alleges political, the other personal motives; and the fairest mode of balancing here as elsewhere, would certainly be to accept both. But inasmuch as the motive given by Josephus stands so much to reason, is besides so completely sufficient, and in its effect upon the timorous petty tyrant seems simply decisive, since moreover any contact between the Baptist and Antipas, even with a view to a special, or as Luke puts it a general, denunciation, is nowhere indicated during the time of his free activity, though all the more during the time of his imprisonment when once begun, and especially since the later fact of the murder of the prophet in prison stands in connexion with denunciations of the marriage, we may let the statement of Josephus pass valid for the Baptist's arrest, that of the Gospels for his execution, and assume that the Gospels have incorrectly assigned the motive for the execution to the earlier period of the arrest, especially as they really relate the latter only in connexion with the former; and that Josephus in turn extended the motive for the arrest to the execution also, especially as he narrates the second solely in connexion with the first.*

Doubtless from Machærus, where he was staying on account of the war with Arabia, which itself was connected with the foul affair of Herodias, Antipas, assuredly not without vigorous agitation on the part of the hierarchy at Jerusalem, and especially of the Scribes, as the words of Jesus show; perhaps also backed by demands of the Roman Procurator Pilate,

ἡγείται, πρὶν τι νεώτερον ἐξ αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι, προλαβὼν ἀναιρεῖν ἢ μεταβολῆς γενομένης εἰς τὰ πράγματα ἐμπεισὼν μετανοεῖν. Καὶ ὁ μὲν ὑποψ'α τῇ Ἡρώδου δέσμιος εἰς τὸν Μαχαιροῦντα πεμφθεὶς, τὸ προειρημένον φρούριον, ταύτη κτίννυται.

* Matt. and Mark relate in point of fact essentially the story of the execution, and Luke is most likely in his short account dependent on this type of the Evangelical narrative. Josephus puts the death in immediate conjunction with the arrest, so much so that Antipas had intended the murder from the first (*ἀναιρεῖν*), and also immediately carries it into execution (*κτίννυται*). The Gospels allow us to hesitate at accepting this rapid sequence of arrest and murder. As here, I have already expressed myself in the *Gesch. Christus*, p. 230 f.

naturally highly suspicious of any popular movement in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem sent his catchpole soldiery northwards to the Jordan, a distance of only about six or eight leagues, conquering for once his nervous hesitance; had the Baptist surprised most likely by night, when though no treachery betrayed him, yet he lacked the faithful protection of the people; had the defenceless victim bound and dragged to the fortress of Machærus, which Josephus designates in distinct terms as the place of John's imprisonment.*

Only a moment afterwards Pilate executed in *his* land in Samaria, the still deadlier, truly Roman ruse against the movement which had there commenced. A mass of armed Samaritans, among whom were the most prominent men, had in answer to the summons of their leader before mentioned, assembled at the foot of Gerizim: the solemn advance was imminent. Pilate anticipated them and occupied the approach with cavalry and infantry troops. Soon it came to a conflict with the multitude that had gathered in the village. Some were slain, the rest fled, many were taken; the heads of the sedition, in fact the leading personages generally, executed. No numbers are named: but in the summer of 67, Cerealis the commander of the fifth legion with 3000 infantry and 600 cavalry cut to pieces 11,500 Samaritans on Gerizim, a fate which a multitude of the people only escaped by having just before gone over to him, fainting with thirst. With this Samaritan murder it is true the rule of Pilate was at once broken; for the Council of the Samaritans at the commencement of the year 36, on the strength of their fidelity to Rome, and the constant favour

* Cf. Matt. xiv. 3 : *κρατήσας, δέσας ἔθετο ἐν φυλακῇ*. Mark vi. 17 : *ἀποστείλας ἐκράτησε κ. τ. λ.* The *παρεδόθη*, Matt. iv. 12. Mark i. 14, still does not point to betrayal: any more than 1 Cor. xi. 23. Cf. Rom. viii. 32. Jesus' revelation as to the co-operation of the hierarchs, Matt. xvii. 12. Machaerus shows afresh in opp. to John the southern point of the Baptist's activity. Hng, Gutachten 32 f. would boldly call in question Machaerus, as John's dungeon; Wieseler Chron. Synops. 250 f. would at least relegate the residence of Ant. to Livias (Julias): groundlessly and against the Gospel narrative, which demands identity of place for him and for the Baptist.

shown to the philoethnic Samaritans by the Emperors, who found here as the Greeks had before them a fulcrum for their control of the restive Jews, preferred its complaint before Vitellius the new plenipotentiary of the East. But while Pilate, afraid of defying his superior, was making ready to journey to Rome and answer for himself, the Jewish people could but raise a helpless plaint on behalf of their captive, and ere long their dead hero.*

The stronghold of Machærus, or as the Jews call it Mikvar, mentioned also in the Talmud and the Targums, now Matshaur (Mkaur, Makaur) named according to Hitzig "Diadem" from its proud coronal form, while Sepp has christened it "Blackburgh," lay on the east side of the Dead Sea, much in the same latitude as Bethlehem the town of David in the territory of the tribe of Juda on the other side, still more in the same as Thekoa, the town of the Prophet Amos, on the southern border of Peræa, where Josephus calls it actually the terminal point, instead of the stream of the Arnon a few leagues further south.† Nature herself had here built a bulwark, like that of the fortress Masada, upon the opposite bank of the Dead Sea more to the south. The steep and almost inaccessible rock with its main front towards the Dead Sea was surrounded on four sides by deep and wide yawning abysses, truly awful fortified trenches superior to all art. Grand, as only in Peræa, fearfully wild and magnificent at once were the general surroundings; here the

* Ant. 18, 4, 1-2. Cf. 18, 5, 2. Further B. J. 3, 7, 32. Involuntarily one is reminded by the Samaritans fainting with thirst of John iv. 13 ff.: and but the more so that this story of the Samaritan woman has otherwise as well the character of a piece of symbolized religious history.

† Jos. B. J. 3, 3, 3. (Machærus, southernmost; Pella, northernmost extremity, Greek *Μαχαροῦς*). Cf. Renan, p. 110, Sepp I., 678. Hitzig kindly communicates: Machærus, with the Jews מִכְוָּר (really therefore מִכְוָּרִין) is the Arabian Mikvarcidaris, and the place is called so from its shape and situation. Renan reads in Talm. Targ. מִכְוָּר = Makaur; this is the form of the word at the present day. A derivation from Machæra (Greek *μάχαιρα*, sword) is not to be thought of, although e.g. the proper name Machæras occurs Ant. 14, 15, 7. Also Machærus, Machæron. The Arnon Deut. ii. 36; iii. 8, 12, and elsewhere.

naked, rent, volcanic stone, inlaid with sulphur and alum ; here again abundant springs, cold and warm, from a hollow in the rocks, constituting health-giving baths ; quite near was Callirhoe where the dying King Herod sought relief : southern vegetation in which the palm, the olive, and the vine were not wanting, most of all famed for a root of pregnant power, the certain cure of those possessed : no wonder if, over all these wonders there spread a veil of legend which even the believing Jewish historian has left unbroken through.* This martial post lost and forsaken for long centuries was again discovered for the learned world in the midst of the Napoleonic wars' alarms by the bold German traveller Jacob Seetzen at the beginning of the year 1807, who had the glory of finding no follower among the multitude of later travellers in Palestine into the deadly wilderness of this land. From the mouth of the tent-dwellers he heard the name of the ruined site Makaur ; it was music in his ears, and in haste he marched to the desired prize, which a year before he had conjectured to be here : while others with furtive glance had here thought to find the remains of Herodion by Bethlehem. He found Machærus on the high peak of a long range of hills, Attarus, in the neighbourhood of which Mount Nebo also, the mountain of Moses' farewell gaze, has been sought, on the northern slope of this mountain chain towards the deep rocky dale of Serka Maein (in Hebrew Maon), with a sheer descent on all four sides, and on three sides quite inaccessible. Even from below an imposing ruin of square form presented itself, above a nearer view disclosed a mighty mural structure made of great blocks of stone. Around a majestic Nature still prevailed. Here a floor of lava, brown, black and red, here pumice-stone, here black masses of basalt forming blocks, as well as walls of rock resting on white limestone ; then again blackish brown iron, the iron mountains of Josephus. The river was romantically overgrown

* B. J. 7, 6, 1 ff. Callirhoe B. J. 1, 33, 5. Ant. 17, 6, 5. Characteristics of Peræa, B. J. 3, 3, 3.

with oleander and date palms, willows, poplars, and sedge. From the cracks in the rocks gushed hot springs impregnated with sulphur giving forth from their waters dense fumes of vapour, the genuine position of the Herodian Callirhoe, which Seetzen following ancient intimations before and after Jerome was fain to find in Lasa or Lisa.* The place had been, just like Masada, artificially fortified in addition since the time of the Maccabees; Machærus half a century after Masada by the King Alexander Jannæus (106-79 B.C.) A younger Alexander, the grandson of the former, continued these works, in order to gain a point of resistance to the victorious Romans under Gabinius as well as to his uncle Hyrcanus II: but he surrendered the fortress and the general Gabinius destroyed it, and, soon afterwards, the scarcely begun fortifications of Aristobulus II. the father of Alexander, who, escaped from Roman captivity, wanted to establish himself here, with 8000 armed men (about 56).† King Herod found here nothing but a place of ruin, but the importance of the rock "on the Arabian mountains," the "Watch-tower of Arabia," did not escape his sharp eye.‡ As he had before built Masada as a bulwark against Judæo-Hasmonæan revolutions and the menaces of Cleopatra, so he here set a barrier against the Arabians.§

The rocky peak was crowned by walls that towered still higher, and mighty corner towers, 160 cubits wide. Below, widely extended battlemented lines of wall were spread across

* First account (Journey in Jan. 1807) from Seetzen's letter to V. Zach in Gotha, Zach's Correspondence, 1808, Vol. 18, 417 ff. Ritter loc. cit. p. 569 ff. The Moabite mountain Nebo in the chain of Abarim, opposite Jericho, Deut. xxxii. 49. Kiepert's map puts it accordingly at the north end of the Dead Sea. Cf. Burckhardt 2, 630. Winer A. Nebo. Also p. 344, note. Jos. B. J. 4, 8, 2: *σιδηροῦν ὄρος*.

† B. J. 7, 6, 2 (King Alexander); B. J. 1, 8, 2. Ant. 14, 5, 2 (Prince Alexander); Ant. 14, 6, 1 (Aristobulus II.) From Ant. 14, 5, 2 it is clear that Josephus has by no means confounded the two Alexanders, since the second Alexander only enlarged the already existing fortification. On Gabinius the follower of Pompey and his campaigns 57-55 cf. with Vol. I. p. 231, also Baumstark, Gens Gabinia, Pauly.

‡ B. J. 7, 6, 2, 1, 8, 2. Ant. 5, 14, 2.

§ B. J. 7, 6, 2. Masada B. J. 7, 8, 3, 4.

the most hazardous ground, and these again were themselves connected with the citadel at the top. Here he founded a town in the midst of the inhospitable land, populating it with Jews and strangers, partly doubtless with the natives of the country. In the year 70 A.D. the town harboured, irrespective of the Jewish garrison in the citadel, a population of at least 2000 men, besides women and children, altogether probably 10,000 persons.* In the centre was a large royal castle, with splendid apartments, and as it appears not without the charm of fine rows of trees, among which a majestically tall and stalwart rue-tree, planted in the days of Herod, was famous until the year 70, when the besieged inhabitants felled it.† The great resemblance of the buildings of Machærus to those of Masada permits us to think of the royal edifice there as corresponding to that at the latter place. Here the walls and floors of the chambers were covered with splendid many-coloured stones: here were magnificent baths; here colonnades whose columns were each composed of a single stone; around the whole ran a turreted wall.‡ As the castle, so the town was lacking in no requisite. There were a number of deep cisterns hewn out, in order to open up the most abundant springs of water to every building on the dry rock; there immense storehouses were placed, both for provisions and for weapons and engines of war.§ In the perfectly similar Masada there was ammunition for 10,000 men, besides unwrought iron, bronze and lead in vast quantities; stores of grain, wine, oil, vegetables and dates, piled in layers, on which the astonished Jews, even after the destruction of Jerusalem, and after them the Romans, could feed.|| So, as Josephus says, had the King vied with Nature's self to make of Machærus a place whose inhabitants could afford to despise even the longest siege.¶ Little did he think that the inhabitant might

* Appears from B. J. 7, 6, 4. 5. Also 2, 18, 6 speaks along with the Roman Garrison of *Ἰουδαίων τὸ πλῆθος*.

† B. J. 7, 6, 2. 3.

‡ B. J. 7, 8, 3. 4.

§ 7, 6, 2.

|| 7, 8, 3. 4. Cf. on Masada Rob. 2, 477 ff.

¶ 7. 6, 2.

come to be also the arch-enemy, the Arabian, against whom he had built the stronghold; and afterwards the Roman; finally, the tyrannized Jewish people, in desperate feud with Idumæans and Romans. Machærus was, before the Jewish revolt, in the hands of the Romans, who evacuated it at the beginning of the war; after the fall of Jerusalem in the autumn of 70, it, actually the second fortress in the land after the capital according to Pliny, became the new and final bulwark of freedom, whose encouragements inspired even the Roman with fear. The imperial legate Lucilius Bassus despaired of taking the virgin fortress by arms; by stratagem he won the surrender of the place in the year 71, and razed the works.*

Here then, cut off from the world, from Israel, and from its spiritual regeneration, whose soul he was, in the midst of a population of warriors and barbarians, Arabians, Idumæans, Amorites, and Moabites, of whose infection by the Preacher of the Kingdom there was no danger, here lay the Baptist, in bodily and spiritual isolation, beneath the castle vaults of the cruelly cunning Antipas. In the arrangements of the fortress there had at that time been no change since the days of King Herod; and it was in the royal castle itself, in one of its turrets, or in the bulwarks of the surrounding walls, that John must have languished, perhaps in view of the regions of the Dead Sea and Jericho, in the neighbourhood of which he had established his place of consecration.

Yet he was for himself no mere thing of the past; even in the prison the Baptist was an effective power. No hand had protected him, no demand of the people claimed his release, no tempest of indignation carried Machærus by storm, no miracle of God flashed like lightning through the sultry air, the awful night, into which the prophet of the Kingdom and the Kingdom itself appeared to have sunk back. And yet in the first place the people, whose faith never flinched, and therefore was so

* The Arabians, see below; the Romans 7, 6, 1 ff., cf. 6, 1: ἣν ἀναγκαῖον ἐξαιρεθῆναι τὸ φρούριον. Before the war, B. J. 2, 18, 8. Plin. H. N. 5, 16.

far like the tremulous murmur of the kingdom of God itself, kept trusty watch and ward before the prison door.

With murderous thoughts, according to Josephus as well as Matthew, had Antipas ushered his victim into the safe-keeping of the silent fortress. Even the second Gospel is not at variance with this view in so far as the motive of the arrest, as known to Mark, the protest of the Baptist against the Tetrarch's fresh marriage, could not but be connected with the deepest hatred of the marrer of his wedlock on the part of the lustful petty tyrant. Yet even apart from this motive, unhistorical as we have seen it to be, the attempt of John against the lord of the land must have awakened such intentions within him. Yet from "fear of the people," whose partizanship for the prophet became formidable to the prince, as yet later to the hierarchs of Jerusalem, as Matthew quite correctly says, the craven tyrant spared for the nonce the life of the prisoner, without, however, as appears from the words of Jesus, hindering his deadliest enemies from coming as inquisitorial intruders, and slaking their spite against their mighty victim by scorn, ill-treatment, and malicious exultation.* But he, the defenceless one, protected himself. Mark shows that in addition to the apprehensions of the Tetrach, nearer acquaintance with John awoke a religious awe in the mind of the sacrilegious monarch. Antipas, Mark relates, feared the Baptist as a righteous and a holy man, took care of him, heard him gladly, and did many things in accordance with his counsel.† From this account, so thoroughly in Mark's pictorial style, some deductions must doubtless be made. One

* Matt. xiv. 5. Cf. xxi. 26. The word of Jesus xvii. 12: they did unto him whatsoever they listed, is a word of revelation. It is scarcely to be narrowed down to solicitations for his capture and execution. Jos. Ant. 18, 5, 2. On the east side of the Dead Sea there dwelt in immediate proximity Amorites and Moabites, the latter to the south of the Arnon. Machærus fell more particularly to the domain of the Amorites (Num. xxi. 13. 26), but had formerly belonged to the Moabites, Cf. the Moabitic Nebo, Deut. xxxii. 49, and the plains of Moab over against Jericho, Num. xxii. 1. Idumæans immediately south by the Dead Sea. † vi. 20.

might accept it in full if one could suppose a longer acquaintance between the prince and the prophet before his prophetic word had cut him to the quick. But the Gospels, Mark included, make this fall at the very beginning of the imprisonment, and even still earlier; and besides there is no likelihood that the outspoken, undaunted John would long have reserved his vigorous rebuke of the marriage which existed before his eyes from any considerations of expediency. This rebuke, however, was certain to put an end at once to all familiarity, even though it did not, as Luke narrates, take the wider form of a general condemnation of the many sins of this reign.* For so much magnanimity cannot historically be ascribed to this weakling immeshed in a woman's toils, that he should quietly put up with the Baptist's boldness, and keep his painful and agreeable impressions so distinct as continually to have consulted him on neutral questions. But if no familiarity took place, there yet arose a religious dread on the part of the prince at the sight of John and at the sound of his words.

Antipas, as well perhaps as Herodias and the court at large, interested himself in the new comer, who had stirred up Israel, so far that something like Agrippa II., Berenike, and Drusilla after him, in their desire to make acquaintance with the Apostle Paul, or as he himself in later times, at least according to the account of the third Gospel, had Jesus brought before him to tickle his curiosity, or to be the butt of his ridicule, he caused John to be ushered into his royal palace from the precincts of the prison.† The Prophet of Israel did not fail to make his mark even before a court, whose pride and levity precluded its repentance; nay, far otherwise than Paul after-

* iii. 19.

† Cf. Acts xxiv. 24 ff. xxv. 13 ff. Luke xxiii. 7 ff. Antipas' holding of his court is at least intimated in Matt. xiv. 2. Had Antipas, according to Wieseler Chron. Synops. der vier Ev. p. 250, resided in Julias (Livias), which Wieseler indeed only assumes, because he seems to know nothing of the palace in Machærus, these rendezvous could scarcely have taken place.

wards before the Procurator Felix and Drusilla, he here became a preacher of repentance and the Kingdom in bonds. "It is not lawful for thee," he said, in the full freedom and superiority of religion, to the man who was master of his life, "to have thy brother's wife."* In thus challenging the marriage of Antipas he took his stand chiefly upon the clear firm ground of the Law, which held good even for Idumæans in their capacity of Jewish princes, often as they may have trodden it under foot amid the craven silence of the hierarchs. The Law had repeatedly forbidden the union with the living brother's wife, as an enormity threatened with childlessness, nor was there, at all events when the father was the same, the expedient of a distinction between brothers and half-brothers.† In this case, as John saw and doubtless also pointed out, the shameful illegality was two-fold, for this marriage had been brought to pass only by the wanton adultery of the wife, and by that of the prince himself.‡ Finally it was brought about by the most outrageous breach of the rights of fraternal hospitality. In order to complete the abomination of this alliance, which Josephus too condemns, there was no need for John to reckon in the nearness of relationship between Antipas and Herodias, the daughter of his brother, since the Law itself with all its rigour had not counted this relationship among its prohibitions, and custom, most of all that of the Herods, had long since overleapt it.§ Let us here realize to ourselves, that Antipas the son of Herod, by his Samaritan wife, had been married many years since to the Arabian princess of Petra, that on a recent journey to Rome when a guest in the house of his half-brother Herod, son of Mariamne the daughter of the

* Matt. xiv. 4. Mark vi. 18. Luke iii. 19.

† Lev. xviii. 16. xx. 21. Deut. xxv. 5. Cf. Jos. Ant. 18, 5, 4: ἐπὶ συγχύσει φρονήσασα τῶν πατρίων τῇ Ἡρώδῃ γαμεῖται τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τῷ ὁμοπατρὶ ἀδελφῷ, διαστᾶσα ζῶντος.

‡ Ex. xx. 14. 17. Lev. xx. 10. Deut. xxiv. 1, 3.

§ Cf. Lev. xviii. 16 ff.; xx. 10 ff. Jos. Ant. 12, 4, 6. Josephus' judgment on the unlawful marriage. Ant. 18, 5, 4, see above.

High Priest Boethos, he had seduced his wife Herodias by amorous and political motives to play false to her husband and to promise him marriage, that finally Herodias, as the daughter of Aristobulus, the murdered son of Herod, and the female descendant of the Hasmonæan House, and of Berenike the niece of the king, had been betrothed and married by the grandfather Herod himself as an alleviation of the misfortunes of the family, whom his guilt had left fatherless,—to her first husband Herod: a marriage, of which Salome was the solitary issue, who had then long been the wife, perhaps already the widow, of Philip, the noblest of Herod's sons.* It costs some trouble to unravel the tangle and mangle of abominations implied in these Idumæan names and marriages; hence we wonder not that the Gospels, and especially the second in its anxiety to establish the facts, should have made sundry mistakes.†

The bitter fruits of his shameful marriage, which dragged their weird growth along until they undermined his throne, Antipas had already in part begun to experience; and that on this very Machærus, if not in his conscience, yet in the external calamities, which in place of the many successes he had dreamt of, attended his fatal step, as a corroboration and complement of the curse of the Law.‡ His rightful spouse having got wind of his evil secret, had on his return from Rome, with his own

* Cf. Jos. B. J. 1, 28, 2. Ant. 17, 1, 3; 18, 5, 1. 4. Also Vol. I. pp. 243, 246, 249.

† Thus Matt. xiv. 6 ff. and Mark vi. 22 ff. have interwoven the young daughter of Herodias as a dancing tragedy with the history of the death of John, whereas the daughter of the first marriage could not possibly at that time have played the part of an altogether youthful danseuse, but a dancing daughter of the second marriage could not as yet have been in existence at all, and was plainly never begotten. Mark however has actually named the brother (Matt. xiv. 3) of "King" Antipas, whom Herodias had for her first husband, as Philip (Mark vi. 17) whereas according to the convincing passages of Josephus he was solely called Herod, and by no means, according to harmonistic conjuring, Herod Philip, B. J. 28, 4. Ant. 17, 1, 3. 18, 5, 1. 4, while Philip the well-known Tetrarch had the daughter of Herodias to wife. In answer to the sorry shifts for getting over this historical error, cf. Gesch. Christus, p. 231.

‡ So far as we know the marriage with Herodias remained without issue. Lev. xx. 21.

unwitting aid, fled by way of Machærus, then in the possession of her father, to the latter in Arabia, and now he was himself for the moment in the fortunately regained Machærus, with the intention of parrying the Arabian king's reply, which meant the bitter earnest of a furious war, to which after all he was destined to succumb, and then to appear at the Court of the Emperor Tiberius as a mendicant suing for aid.* Now once more in Machærus the Baptist had struck him a more painful blow; he had smitten his conscience. He would now have double grounds for busying himself with the thought of getting rid of the dreaded man, who disturbed his peace, by murder: and the provocation to the crime was raked into fresh flame by the baughty and offended woman, who now swayed his will, and felt herself most of all struck at by the Baptist's accusation of her husband, conscious as she was of the violation of her own first wifely fidelity, and of her own actual seduction of the weak man who had wed her. Nevertheless Antipas withstood himself and Herodias' lust for murder. He preserved the Baptist's life, he protected him against the wiles of the deadly enemy, who was never at a loss for resources of attack; and as far as he could make the restraint tolerable to him he did so. On this head the most

* At the flight of the daughter of Aretas, this Arabian has Machærus (*Ant.* 18, 5, 1); just afterwards it belongs again to Antipas, (§ 2) as indeed it subsequently continued to belong to Judæa (*B. J.* 3, 3, 3.) That the reading here is not doubtful I have shown more in detail in the *Gesch. Christus*, p. 231 f. in opposition to Ewald. These border places were lost and won: in the beginning of the war with Aretas, Antipas must have surprised Machærus (similarly Renan, p. 111), Sepp and Gams (*Gesch. Chr.* 234), nay already Süsskind (*Bengel's Archiv* 1, 313), after the Arabians, perhaps since the death of Herod the Great (*Ant.* 17, 10, 9. *B. J.* 2, 5, 1. 3), had taken it or got it by treaty with Antipas (Aretas' son-in-law). Thus in the immediate neighbourhood of Machærus is Lescha or Callirhoe (*Gen.* x. 19, cf. Jerome *Quæst.* in *Gen.* *Wincr. A.* Lescha, probably identical with Lusa or Lyssa (*Ant.* 14, 1, 4, cf. p. 337), by Jannæus won from the Arabs, by Hyrcanus II. given back to Aretas, lastly occupied again by Herod, 17, 6, 5. On the Arabian war details will be found in the section on Chronology which follows further down. The hatred between the races, *Tac. Hist.* 5, 1: solito inter accolæ odio infensa Judæis Arabum manus.

varying statements of the Gospels so far agree, that we can no more doubt the respectful self-restraint of the Tetrarch towards John than we can, who it is to whom the Gospels point as the persecutress, even though Herodias comes near enough to the portrait of Jezebel, the ancient enemy of the prophets, and though the catastrophe which befel the Baptist may be related not without a touch of legendary tone.* Most faithfully perhaps is the attitude, not exactly of friendship, but of veneration, which the Prince maintained towards the Baptist expressed in his unshaken and well-attested belief, that the slain was yet alive, and had arisen again with mighty words and wonders.†

Now all these facts—that Antipas bore with John and let him live, while among Idumæans the lives of men were at other times made a sport of; nay that the tyrant cared for him and watched over him, he who at other times thought only of himself, and that in this care for him he overcame on the one hand his deadly grudge, on the other his miserable irresolution, all this is surely not to be explained by mere apprehensions of the people, it is a sign, such as has no parallel, of John's greatness, of the impressions he could produce in the soul of this not merely weak, but in selfishness, sensuality and spite, wholly characterless man; of his power to awaken whatever nobility, whatever serious struggle of good against evil was possible in such a case, a power which the Man of God himself could bring to bear on the very stones of the wilderness. Thus then, alarm and irresolution, conscious guilt and esteem worked together to secure the Baptist his life for a while longer, until the rancorous woman whose removal John demanded, by stealth attained the goal, which her tempestuous wrath had striven in vain to reach. It was part of the

* Cf. Matt. xiv. 3 ff. Mark vi. 17 ff. The alleviation of the imprisonment, see below. Cf. therewith the permission of honourable burial. Matt. xiv. 12. Mark vi. 29.

† Matt. xiv. 1 ff. Mark vi. 14 ff. Luke ix. 7 ff.

clemency of the prince, as of the less refined system of torture to which prison life in ancient times especially in the East was subject, that the Baptist's dungeon had still a faint breath of free intercourse with the outer world left open to it. He was visited by his disciples, they shared his prison, it may be, with him in turns, heard his word of instruction, went through the wonted exercises with him, and issued forth again, in order to convey messages abroad to the friends and members of the alliance.* With all that Antipas had nothing to fear, but the Baptist found nothing to hope for either. His band of disciples might hold together in fastings and ablutions, perhaps even carry further the preaching of the Kingdom, and the baptismal sign: the popular stream on its grander scale passed away, now that its head was wanting: and if John himself named his representative, in none of his disciples, any more than in himself, did the real solution, the Messiah arise. In so far the mission of the Baptist had spent itself, and even Machærus was less his doom by the will of the petty prince, than it was the resting point of his historical activity, harsh as the form in which it appeared, and just in this guise more friendly, than his removal from the Jordan in the midst of that activity, of which the fourth Gospel tells. In this violent blow his religious spirit read the word of his God, which ordered him to repose, even as it had called him. Now Machærus was his watch-tower from which, as Moses of yore surveyed Israel from the neighbouring Nebo, he observed the goings of Jesus, and longed for the Messiah. The only certain tidings of his life which reach us from his prison are his glances at the future, with which he sought not himself but the redemption of his people. And again it was the will of God, that while the prophet sought, but nothing saw, and brooding died without beholding, the Redeemer was actually wending his way through Israel.

* Matt. ix. 14. xi. 2 ff. xiv. 12. Acts xviii. 25. xix. 1 ff.

II. JESUS IN CAPERNAUM.

For Jesus the imprisonment of the Baptist was the third consecration. The prophet of the Kingdom of God in fetters! that might be a sign that God neither acknowledged John nor the coming of the Kingdom, and that Roman and Idumæan sway were to lie still longer on the people as a dark divine necessity. But for Jesus the voices by Jordan and in the wild had spoken louder than the sound of John's clanking fetters, and so that inner history gave to this outer one another and a new interpretation. In the withdrawal of John, that so notably coincided with his own exit from the wilderness and its temptation, he read a final token that the hour was come, for succeeding to the Preparer of the way before him, whom he needed not to displace, but whom God had called away; and for being the Messiah of the forsaken people.* The withdrawal of the Baptist strengthened the assurance of his self-recognition. It was not only prudence which counselled him to get out of the way of the Jerusalemic hierarchy and the tyrant on the lower Jordan; and to remove the sphere of his activity three days' journey away from Judæa, from the Jordan, and the multitudes, and to choose his own home, where he felt firm ground beneath him, and at any rate found greater freedom of action, as the place of his retreat, yet at the same as the head-quarters of his work: no, he acted thus from faith in the will of God, that His kingdom must be built up in a purely spiritual form without signs and symbols, without the stir of crowds, excitements and dreamy expectations, cleared of all confusions, of carnal temptations such as beset the people, and carnal suspicions such as magnates might entertain.†

* How utterly different again does this historical dénouement, Matt. iv. 12, appear contrasted with the unhistorical and painfully artificial one, John iii. 22 ff. With the latter most of all agrees the account of Just. Tryph. 50.

† Retreat, Matt. iv. 12. Mark i. 14: he came. Luke iv. 14: returned. De Wette has translated the verb in Matt. went away: and declared the above expla-

Little as he lacked the full courage of a man, which his public appearance in this position of affairs sufficiently proved, yet at all events the wisdom shown in his entrance upon public life secured him against the suspicious ruler of the land, who, as a Peræan potentate, had just exhibited an unwonted display of energy against the cause of the Kingdom of God. The question whether Jesus apart from these external motives would have stayed in Judæa, and become a Judæan prophet, history has foreclosed for us: we might suppose, subject to correction, that Jesus himself, independently of these momentary exigences, would have been led by his aversion to political agitations on a foreign soil, and by his love of quiet, and the kindlier surroundings of his home, to pursue the same course. The fourth Gospel it is true has taken another view of all this: but of its general confusion of history this too forms a part, that Jesus according to it challenged the suspicion of perpetuating Johannine attempts, a suspicion which as a matter of history he rather sought to evade.* No doubt Galilee was in many respects but an unfavourable starting point for the Messiahship: as we have seen in our review of the land itself, when we noticed the scorn of the Galilæans and of the Galilæan prophet which prevailed at Jerusalem. "Behold out of Galilee no prophet hath arisen."† Hence the subsequent pains displayed by the first Gospel, and the Nazarenes at a time far more recent still, to prove from passages in Isaiah that the land of Zebulon and Naphtali must needs have been the first to behold the Light of Messianic Salvation.‡

nation which is grammatically and factually the only correct one to be forced upon the text. Bleek again (*Synops. I.*, 207) finds the account of Matt. obscure, so far as Jesus after all was as little sheltered in Galilee from the one ruler of the land in both provinces as he had been in Peræa: but it is evident from the above how the altered relations must have sheltered him. That Jesus by retiring did not delay the Messiahship itself, is shown by its final stages of development as well as by the direct statement of the Gospels.

* Cf. John iv. 1-2.

† John vii. 51, cf. p. 5.

‡ Matt. iv. 14 ff. referring to Isa. ix. 1. Cf. also Iren. fragm. 17. The later Nazarenes on Isa. ix. 1, see Jerome ad. Jes. ix. 1, in *Köstlin, Synopt. Ev.* p. 33.

Were there indeed any reliable evidence for the pre-christian origin of the statements in Targum and Talmud concerning an expected Messiah of Ephraim, the son of Joseph, then even the entrance of Jesus on his career in Galilee would appear in another light.* In the midst of Galilee, the first fruits of the Asiatic exile, according to a prophetic passage (Isa. ix. 1), the Messiah born of Ephraim, nay of the house of Jeroboam, and the son of Joseph was to gather the Israelites, the ten tribes, and repairing the ancient breach in the kingdom, march at their head to Jerusalem, submit himself to Messiah Son of David, then meet a violent death at the hands of Gog and Magog, the northern heathens, in expiation of the sin of Jeroboam, nay of the whole people. Did Jesus, perhaps, aware of these expectations, and with an eye to the same, settle in Galilee as the decisive starting point, in order to set the Kingdom of God in motion, and facilitate his own Messianic resolve by the thought of being after all but a pioneer of the Son of David, and did he enter on his final journey to Jerusalem, only in order by doing or by suffering to summon to the front the Messiah Ben-David? Or may it be that the history of his life has actually been cut in artificial conformity to this pattern: was he called Son of Joseph only in order to represent the Galilæan Messiah, and was the fatal journey to Jerusalem only a story told in order to exhibit in his person the tragic destiny of the ideal Messiah of Galilee? Fortunately we are still enabled to answer these questions. To

* The passages in Schöttgen Hor. Hebr. p. 360 (cf. Lightf. 248, 687), especially Bertholdt, loc. cit. p. 74 ff., cf. Oehler Art. Messias, Herzog IX., 440. Cf. Targ. Cant. 4, 5 and 7, 3: duo salvatores tui, qui te salvaturi sunt, *Messias filius David* et *Messias filius Ephraim*, similes sunt Mosi et Aaroni. Talmudists in Bertholdt, p. 78 ff.: primum veniet Messias ben Joseph et postea M. ben David atque tunc restituet domus Josephi quod per scissionem regni in detrimentum domus Davidicæ fecit; etenim M. ben Joseph non venit in suam ipsius utilitatem, set venit propter Messiam Davidam. Nam ille semet ipsum vitamque suam morti tradet et sanguis ejus placabit populum.—Congregabuntur Israelitæ in Galilæa superiore atque ibi in medio Galilææ eos avide expectabit M. ben Joseph et omnes Israelitæ istinc cum eo proficiscentur ad Hierosolyma.—M. Josephida primum revelabitur in Galilæa, nam ibi initium cœpit captivitas.—M. Josephida confoditur gladio Gogi et Magogi idque propter peccatum Jerobeami, &c.

begin with, there is no likelihood that this picture of a Galilæan Messiah was already in existence at the time of Jesus, since the New Testament shows no trace of it and knows nothing of any Messiah but one, and that one of Davidic descent, and even so the elder Targums too, and indeed the elder Jerusalem Gemara as distinguished from the amplifications of the Babylonian Gemara and the Book of Sohar. True we may not assume with Schöttgen that these Jewish notions owed their original rise to Christian influence. Who can believe that Jewish orthodoxy could have made the person of Jesus the groundwork of its dogma? It is surely far more natural to assume, and plain indications plead for the assumption, that subsequent zealous elaboration of the Jewish scholastic doctrine about the Messiah, devised the picture of a Galilæan Messiah partly in the interest of a justification of those prophetic passages which speak of a salvation from the North Country, and of the enigmatical suffering and death of the Messiah, which could not touch the perfect Christ, and partly in the finely conceived attempt to heal the ancient schism between North and South, through the former's subjection to the latter, a dogmatic reconciliation, the precise counterpart of that actual composition of the feud which not only Galilee's zeal for the faith in later times, but still more the migration of Rabbiniism from the ruins of Jerusalem to Tiberias and Sepphoris had practically brought to pass. But to abide by the main point—any influence of these expectations, either on Jesus or on the Evangelists, must meet with a denial all the more complete that Jesus clearly never regarded himself as a Galilæan Messiah, the forerunner of another, and of non-Davidic descent, but as himself the very Christ, and the deliverer of the whole people. Thus much only do we perceive from these later formations of opinion, as well as from the appeals of the Gospel itself to such prophetic passages; namely, that the ministry in Galilee had a connexion, however comparatively weak, yet at all events in some sort active in popular reflexion, with the great promise vouch-

safed to Israel. And Elijah, Elisha, Hosea, Jonah, Nahum ; those at any rate were names which put to shame the hierarchy's scorn of the prophetless Galilee, as the outcome of mere ignorance. Besides the people of this land were, as we have long since seen, susceptible to a new progressive impetus in preaching, and the symbol of baptism which hundreds, nay thousands, had brought with them from the Jordan, formed the line of union between this northern population and the Messianic commotion which had stirred the nation at large, and which had found its footing by the Jordan. In so far the appearance of Jesus in Galilee had points of contact and a congenial soil ; we may be sure Jesus was aware of that without building upon it, for he was great enough not to stake his faith and trust on calculations of the degrees of local advantage ; on peoples any more than on princes. In the lanes of Jerusalem a year later the cry was raised, notwithstanding all scruples about Galilee, "the Prophet Jesus of Nazara in Galilee," because that prophet He was.*

To one of our Gospels, it is true, this exposure of Galilee to the damaging judgment of public opinion was disconcerting enough : so that in view of all the taunts which were levelled against it, and which with peculiar diligence it has raked together, it has taxed its utmost artifice and its utmost faith to vindicate the notion, that Jesus after all was not merely the Galilæan, but before all things else, the Judæan prophet.† True the Evangelist does not deny that Jesus was a Galilæan and a Nazarene, just as little as that he now and then worked in Galilee. Yet still his calling was entered on not in Galilee, but in Judæa partly by the Jordan, partly in Jerusalem at the paschal feast : his withdrawal to Galilee, apart from his flying excursion to Cana in that province, was occasioned only by the suspicion of the Pharisees excited by his continuance of the work

* Indifference to people and princes, Matt. xi. 19 ; xvi. 13. Luke xiii. 32. The call Matt. xxi. 11. The prophets of Galilee p. 14.

† John i. 46 ; vii. 52. Cf. Matt. xxi. 11. iv. 45.

of John, and the belief of the Galilæans "at home" was only developed on the ground of his mighty deeds in Jerusalem !* Altogether Jesus is always so transiently present in Galilee, that the title of Galilæan prophet becomes quite too narrow for him, at least his three sojourns there are narrated much more shortly than those in Jerusalem, especially the first and the second : the third at the time of one of the paschal feasts seems longer and extends to the Feast of Tabernacles, but far longer still is the third and final sojourn in Jerusalem, for it lasts from the Feast of Tabernacles to the fatal Passover, a full half year, and is described at very great length.† It has been disputed whether it is in John or in the other Gospels that we have the most faithful narration ; John has been given the preference on account of his so-called eye-witness, the Synoptics have been thrust into the background because of the so-called one-sidedness of their Galilæan tradition, and quite unambiguous tokens have actually been discovered of a long and frequently recurring ministry of Jesus in Judæa and Jerusalem. Well this eye-witness is truly very questionable, the Galilæan point of view of the three older Gospels no less so, inasmuch as, to put it shortly, they relate the final history of Jesus in Jerusalem with much greater accuracy of detail than John, as regards its main points, the apparent indications finally of a frequent sojourn in Jerusalem are all the less dependable, inasmuch as Jesus was actually some time in Judæa before his death, and Judæa and Jerusalem had beforehand flocked to him in Galilee.‡ Here not only have we the

* This verse explains verse 44 entirely. In the Tübingen School it was found possible to suppose on account of the context of vv. 43 and 44 that Jesus in v. 44 meant to designate Judæa, whence he goes to Galilee, as his unsusceptible native land : but this were surely quite at variance with the well known fact, (thus represented even by the 4th Gospel) of his derivation from Galilee and Nazara, and v. 45 gives the full explanation, inasmuch as his native Galilee had grown more susceptible in consequence of Jesus' work in Jerusalem.

† First stay in Galilee ii. 1-12 : second iv. 3, 43-54 ; third vi. 1-7, 9. The third in Judæa and Jerusalem vii. 10 to the end of the Gospel.

‡ The proofs in my *Gesch. Chr.* Ed. 3, p. 19 f. Cf. Matt. iv. 25 ; xv. 1. Luke v. 17.

voice of the three Synoptics, against the wholly isolated fourth Gospel; but they have the sources of the Acts of the Apostles also on their side.* Further, an artificial shifting of Jesus' ministry to Galilee is by no means conceivable, when we consider that in the time that the Gospels arose, it was Jerusalem and not Galilee at all which was the centre of the Christian community of the land; but all the more conceivable is a shifting of that ministry to Judæa and Jerusalem, just because Galilee could not pass either among Jews or Christians as the seat of God's Kingdom either then or at a future time; and was accordingly not the worthy abode of the Messiah, or of the Son of God.† And who can fail to lay his hands on the palpable artifice of the fourth Gospel? An uncritical mind will find mystery and profundity in Jesus' three journeys to Galilee, and three again to Jerusalem, in the three passovers that he kept, the middle one in Galilee, the beginning and end (his passover of Blood) in Jerusalem; we for our part cannot forget that history does not easily round itself off so neatly, and that this equal and yet very unequal distribution of portions between Galilee and Jerusalem gives one altogether the impression of a compromise by which the lawful claimant is to lose nothing, and yet the new aspirant is to gain everything.‡ Finally, surveying this hanselled history in detail from the wedding journey downwards, as closely and as broadly as we will, we are uniformly confronted at every point by the most striking evidence of artificial production.

When Jesus determined to make his appearance in Galilee, he recognized clearly before all else, that, returning as he did in a new character, and intending as he did to be his people's leader, he must break with the external relations in which he had hitherto stood. His home and family were not the sphere

* Acts x. 37, 39.

† Hence Jerusalem the future place of the Son of God cf. Matt. xxiii. 39; xxvi. 64. Acts i. 4 ff. Rev. xxi. 1 ff. Cf. Ewald's remarks above, Vol. I. p. 176 N.

‡ Vol. I. pp. 157, 166.

for his activity ; they applied the most pettily human scale of measurement to his person and work, of which the antecedent had been a growth at once so obvious and so obscure ; as he afterwards so clearly experienced and expressed.

Besides this, it may be that the situation of the former among the mountains was too isolated. The Gospels agree in representing him as commencing his work in Galilee with Capernaum as his head-quarters, which lay about ten leagues north-east of Nazara on the Lake of Galilee. Matthew makes express mention at the very outset of this change of abode, and afterwards repeatedly represents him as returning again to this place as his own town and to his own house.* In Luke and Mark he appears at any rate at the first commencement of his preaching the Kingdom in Galilee, or, as Mark states, by the Lake of Gennesaret, at Capernaum, and is even afterwards always coming into view again at this point.† Marcion's "Gospel according to Luke," makes him come straight from heaven, and fix himself at Capernaum.‡ Even according to John, Jesus arrives in Capernaum on his first Galilæan excursion after the marriage in Cana, where he is stated to have dwelt for a short time with his mother and brethren ; in the second excursion he at all events comes into communication with Capernaum from Cana, and in the third he is at work at Capernaum.§ On these and many other grounds (one has only to think of the subsequent memorable denunciation of woe upon Capernaum) the historical reality of this settlement admits of no doubt, especially as Capernaum is a wholly unknown name, which the first Evangelist, or his Reviser, in quest of prophecies, only just managed to bring into connexion with the

* Matt. xiii. 54 ff. ; iv. 13-17 ; ix. 1 ; xiii. 1, 36.

† Luke iv. 14. Mark i. 14-21 ; ii. 1 ; iii. 19, 31 ; vii. 17.

‡ Tert. c. Marc. 4, 7 : anno XV. principatus Tiberiani proponit eum descendisse in civitatem Galilææ Capharnaum.

§ ii. 12 ; iv. 46 ff. ; vi. 17, 59. The real relation of Jesus to his family (p. 32) is in John ii. 1 ff. ; xix. 25 ff. just as much idealized as his Galilæism.

several-times-cited prophecy of Isaiah concerning Galilee, as being a place on the borders of the tribes of Zebulon and Naphthali.* Only the possibility favoured by Luke and Mark still must be left open, that Jesus did not establish himself there at the very beginning, but only after his first journeys and proclamations on behalf of the Kingdom. Luke, in particular, seems to favour the opinion that Jesus began his ministry in his native town Nazara, and only sought Capernaum after failure at home. Mark, again, that it was only after the entrance of Peter into his discipleship, that as his guest he occupied his house in Capernaum. But, really, Luke very plainly pre-supposes a ministry in Capernaum as preceding the purely artificial inaugural discourse in Nazara, and just as really, even according to Mark, quite apart from the definite statement of Matthew and of Luke, the settlement of Jesus in Capernaum was quite independent of the person of Peter and his house: for the Master, who had just sounded his summons, "Follow me" to Peter, he was not the next moment the mere follower of Peter to his town and to his house.† Besides all this the only thing that seems to stand to reason is that Jesus at the well-considered commencement of his work took up a fixed station for himself, instead of moving hither and thither without a home, and in a certain sense without a plan; and equally that he made this station, independent of persons and

* Matt. iv. 13 ff. vv. 14-16 perhaps by the redactor on account of the Hebrew quotation, Vol. I. p. 85. The woe xi. 23. Cap. in Naphthali acc. to Josh. xix. 35 ff. Cf. below, page 374.

† Luke iv. 16-31. Mark. i. 16-21, 29-37.

‡ Luke iv. 23. Mark i. 16 ff. Mark distinguishes himself here from Matt. in that the entrance into Capernaum with Peter is with him the first entrance, with Matt. the second: from Luke that the entrance of Jesus is indeed the first but not an entrance with Peter (iv. 31). Further there is the apparent difference, that Jesus in Matt. and Luke (viii. 14 ff. : iv. 38 ff.) plainly does not stay in Peter's house, while one *may* so expound Mark i. 29, 32, as if Jesus remained there overnight. But in the first place nothing hinders us from explaining Mark in conformity with the other two, and moreover the sojourn of Jesus in Capernaum even in Mark i. 20-29 is entirely independent of Peter and his house.

houses of entertainment: he who grants this, will quite simply adhere to Matthew.

The choice of Capernaum was, as we shall ultimately find, characteristic of the public appearance of Jesus in more than one respect. About the place itself one does not hear much for some time. The Old Testament never named it. Hence it may be that it did not spring up until after the Exile.* Even the name varies. Most of the MSS. of the New Testament give the name Capernaum, to which the pronunciation Caparnaum, Cabarnaum in Ptolemæus and in single MSS. approaches most nearly: yet the best and oldest MSS. and versions, Marcion and a series of Fathers, read Capharnaum, or perhaps once Caphernaum. With this agree not only Josephus and later Judæism, inasmuch as the former knows of a well Capharnaum and a locality Capharnome by the Lake of Genesaret, and the latter of a town Kepharnachum, but also the etymology most clearly marked in the latter form. For the word Caphar [Capar], *i.e.* village, occurs in a number of names of places in Josephus, as well as in the Old Testament, and even in the present day. A second Capernaum even is found by Lightfoot, noticed by William of Tyre as a not unimportant seaport in the neighbourhood of Tyre. Kepharnachum means simply "Nahumsthorpe," whether, as is most likely, we are to think in this connexion of the well-known Galilæan prophet, whose grave was sought for here, or of another of the same name. For the interpretations of Origen, "Place of Comfort," and of Jerome, "Place of Loveliness," are ingenious indeed but improbable; the latter even at variance with linguistic laws. True Wieseler, quite recently, inclines to the opinion that the name "Village of the Consoler" had some share in determining Jesus in the choice of a spot, which from the very commencement was to be a symbol of his mission as the Me-

* The name must else have stood in Josh. xix. 32 ff.

nahem of the Old Testament and of the Rabbis ; as if he had begun or accomplished his mission with such petty considerations as these, of which too every historical trace is wanting.* The Gospels call Capernaum a town, lying on the west shore of the Lake of Gennesaret by the way of the sea, in possession of a synagogue with Chiefs and Elders, as well as of extensive customs, and a partly heathen garrison.† Doubtless Capernaum was a place of no mean importance, that by dint of its agriculture, especially its excellent wheat, and by means of its fisheries and commerce, had grown from a village to an opulent town, to which in particular the way of the sea so named from Isaiah's to Matthew's day, and even to the time of the Franciscan Quaresmius in the 17th century, connecting as it did the Mediterranean with Syria, Ptolemais and Damascus, and coasting the Lake of Gennesaret a league's length, would afford abundant openings for intercourse and trade, as well with Phœnicia as with Syria.‡ Of its opulence a trace is afforded not only by the feast in Peter's house, or the feast of publicans, but also by Jesus' word of rebuke to the Galilæans.§ Side by side with it there ran no doubt, and that not only in the case of

* Cf. along with Tischendorf's great crit. Ed. New Testament 8 (only just begun) Lightf. p. 227, 579. Winer, A. Capernanm (כַּפְּרֶנָּת). Robinson III. 545. Sepp II. 176 ff. Orig. χωρίον παρακλήσεως. Jer. : villa pulcherrima = Kapharnaim). Wieseler Chron. Syn. p. 169 : Nachum = Comfort, Comforter. Cf. Menahem p. 297 N. Why then is there not given even in Matt. xi. 23 any allusion to it ? Lightf. 579 cites Will. of Tyre 10, 26 : in loco, qui dicitur Petra incisa, juxta antiquam Tyrum inter Capharnaum et Doram, oppida maritima.

† Cf. Matt. iv. 13 ff. ; ix. 1. Luke iv. 31. Mark i. 21. Luke iv. 31 ; vii. 5. Matt. ix. 9 ff. ; viii. 5.

‡ The name Isa. ix. 1. Matt. iv. 15. Quaresmius : via maris publica quædam via est, qua venit ex Assyria ad mare Mediterraneum. Quaresmius probably hit the right sense of this "Sea Way," whereas the explanation "Lake Way" as being by the Lake of Gennesaret (cf. Robinson III. 552) or the far more general "Sea Region" (*ib.*) is to be rejected, the former particularly because the road only ran a short stretch (between Magdala and Capernaum) along the lake, cf. along with Robinson Leyrer Art. Strassen in Palästina in Herzog. The famous wheat Grätz p. 360.

§ Matt. viii. 15 ; ix. 10 ; xi. 7 ff. ; 20 ff. To refer v. 23 (Winer) to outward prosperity is a flat explanation.

“publicans and sinners,” much love of enjoyment, vanity, capriciousness, and hardness of heart, which Jesus was finally to crown with his woe; yet should we not forget how much receptivity he here met with in this more stirring atmosphere of Galilæan social life, in the motley mingling of avocations, and how much of a piety that attracted even heathendom must have gathered about the synagogue.*

On closer view Capernaum was one of the most glorious spots of the Lake of Gennesaret. Of that Lake at large the Rabbis used to say, “Seven seas, spake God the Lord, have I created in the land of Canaan, but only one have I chosen for myself, that is the sea of Gennesar.” This lake-land is called by Josephus the crown of Galilee. The Rabbis extol the fruits of the land of Gennesar.† Capernaum itself lay in the pearl of this neighbourhood, the district of Gennesar. This district of the west shore is several times named by the Gospels, without exactly placing Capernaum in that part: but from a mere comparison of the fourth Gospel’s account of Jesus’ arrival upon the west shore after the Great Feeding, and after the storm, with the accounts of the first and second Gospels, it appears that it was just in this district that the town of Jesus lay.‡ Add to this that Josephus has placed the abundant well of Capharnaum in the midst of this tract of country; and has given a full countenance for placing in the very same district the village Kepharnome mentioned in another connexion as the place where, when wounded at the north end of the lake, he found his first night’s rest: especially as the name of the well could only be transferred to it from a place, from “a village” of that name. Finally, as late as the 7th century, the French Bishop Arkulfus is in favour of this position.§ It is

* Matt. ix. 11; xi. 7 ff. Luke vii. 5.

† Midrash Tillim fol. 4, 1 in Sepp. II. 170. Lightf. 2, 227. Jos. 18, 2, 3: τὰ κράτιστα τῆς Γ.

‡ Cf. Matt. xiv. 34. Mark vi. 53. John vi. 17 ff. Lightf. 227. Robinson III., 544.

§ Jos. B. J. 3, 10, 8. Vit. 72: Cf. Robinson III., 545, 548.

true that modern visitors of the Holy Land have somewhat damped our notions of the beauty of the Lake of Gennesaret's shores. "He," says Robinson, "who here looks round for the splendour of the Swiss lakes (with which however the Emperor Titus is said to have compared it), or with the gentler beauty of those in England or in the United States, will find himself disappointed. My expectations were not of this kind, and yet, after the romantic character of the country round the Dead Sea, and in other parts of Palestine, I had certainly promised myself something more striking."* Much that was lovely in detail was seen notwithstanding even by him, and above all the contrast of a landscape robed in the green of springtime, to the summer parched vegetation of the mountains and valleys, he freely admitted. Hence the very different verdict of Seetzen: "in the whole of Palestine there is no district whose natural charms could compare with those of this!"

If we take into account the enormous deterioration which the landscape has suffered by the desolation of the once so thickly populated shores, where the white shining towns and villages used to greet each other face to face, as well as of the mirror of the Lake itself, on which of old countless fishing-barks (but also pirate vessels), used to gambol, whereas to-day scarcely one, nay indeed comically enough always just one good or even half rotten skiff is to be spied, it is said; if in connexion with this we think of the ruin of richer cultivation and plantation, and if with Schubert we admit the inference afforded by the power of propagation and the splendour of southern vegetation, such as it still appears here and there, especially by the gushing springs

* III. 500. Titus conqueror of Pal. in years 67-70 A.D. (cf. my *Art. Vesp.*) is said to have intended to call the district on the Lake of Neufchâtel by *Aventicum*, which he filled with splendid buildings, *Galilæa*, because of the likeness. *Frec. Chron.* II., 2, 3. *Civit. Aventicum, quam pater ejus Vesp. ædificare cœperat, consummavit et gloriôsè ornavit in Gallia cisalpina. Eandemque regionem stagno adjacentem propter similitudinem, ut ferunt, Galilæae Palestinorum, quam non modico sudore et sanguine devicerat, Galilæam censuit appellari.* Perhaps from Tac. *Hist. L.V. deperd.*

of the Lake, in the form of sturdy palms and ruddily gleaming oleanders, we shall find with Seetzen and Schubert in the ancient praise of this "Eden Land," no mere Jewish exaggeration, nor even an amazement only justified by the contrast of Jerusalem's bare rocks, but a description according to desert.*

The Lake of Gennesaret, the second lake-basin of any size, which the Jordan forms in its upper course, whence after long wandering southwards it issues near Jerusalem in the last and greatest, namely the Dead Sea,—is like the whole valley of the Jordan a portion of the mighty volcanically formed fissure in the earth which cuts through the flat limestone layer between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean, and divides it into a western and an eastern portion. This volcanic oval shaped cauldron filled with water of unequal but nowhere of very great depth, nearly as far below the mirror of the Mediterranean as the Dead Sea itself (between 500-600 feet), with a length of five, and a breadth of from two to three leagues, has a margin of mountain heights reaching an elevation of 1000 feet, on the south and east, and 500 on the north-west, followed however to the rear northward by the loftily rising mountains of Safed, and finally by Hermon on its throne of snow, which excited the admiration even of the Roman Tacitus.† On the east side the mountain chain rears itself like a wall, partly of blackish basalt, with greater boldness than in the west; a few deep ravines break their way through to the Lake. On the west

* Cf. on Seetzen Ritter's *Erdkunde*, 15th part, 1st. Ed. 3rd Book: Western Asia 2nd Ed. 1850, p. 290 ff. Schubert 3, 238. Alive with ships cf. naval fight of Taricheæ B. J. 3, 10, 5 ff. The Galileans had indeed only little fishing and pirate skiffs, the Romans floats. The lake was full of blood and corpses.

† Robinson 3, 511 ff. 571, 573. Dead Sea c. 600 f. Gennes. 535 (acc. to Schubert). Robinson N. *Forsch.* 458: 600-700 fr. The dimensions of the Lake are given by Jos. B. J. 3, 10, 7 at 140 stades long, 40 broad. The depth by Molineux 120-156 Engl. f. Rüetschi A. *Geneareth* in Herzog. Cf. the short, fresh description of Tac. *Hist.* 5, 6: *Jordanes pelago non accipitur, sed unum atque alterum lacum integer perfluit tertio retinetur.* Of Lebanon just before: *præcipuum montium Libanum erigit, mirum dictu, tantos inter ardores opacum fidumque nivibus.*

the rise is gentler, the mountains have more of the nature of limestone, and indeed are fairly rounded in form : still to the south-west more rugged peaks, further north the semicircular disposition of the mountain chain and the green shore-land, interposed between the hills and the ripples of the Lake, combine to produce a picturesque effect.*

The water of the Lake is clear as crystal and transparent to the bottom ; the colour greenish ; the taste sweet and pleasant, though here and there slightly brackish ; the temperature mild a bath in it refreshing.† As a rule the Lake lies calm, but deeply bedded as it is among higher tracts of land, like all the hollow country it has tales to tell of storms in winter, and even in the summer of sudden mighty gusts. The wealth of fish is still what it was of old ; they may be caught without much trouble, are tender and pleasant to the taste, in part of the same species that are met with in the Nile.‡ The strand shows side by side with sand, shingle and pretty shells, great layers of black basaltic stone of frequent occurrence, signs of a volcanic character, as well as the hot springs in the neighbourhood of Tiberias : its outermost edge is often formed by rushes and sedge growing on miry ground, where a merry troop of birds disports itself ; among which the pelican and most of all the Jewish favourite bird the turtle-dove are distinguished. Further inwards, and part way up the mountains the dark coloured earth, especially where watered by springs, is extremely fertile. and alongside of green pastures are found to this day plantations like those by Jericho, wheat, barley, millet, rice, melons, grapes, vegetables, tobacco, indigo, nor are date palms, figs, citrons and oranges wanting. A peculiar celebrity belongs to the melons exported to Akko and Damascus, with which

* P. 500, 511. Cf. Furrer, p. 321.

† Cf. Josephus B. J. III., 10, 7. F. A. Strauss *Sinai u. Golgotha*, 2nd Ed. 1848, p. 141. Furrer, p. 325. Peculiar punishment by drowning in the Lake, Ant. 14, 15, 10. Matt. xviii. 6.

‡ Robinson p. 510.

Burckhardt made valuable presents to his Damascene friends.* Splendid wild-growing oleanders, palms, figs and nubk-trees are the pride of the district, and there is no doubt but that in former times they grew much more numerous, and that there is not a splendid plant of southern zones which could refuse its grateful growth to these parts.† The climate is even in winter so mild, that a fall of snow counts among rarities: in summer the heat in this confined hollow, excluding as it does the west-wind, the only thing that cools a Palestinian summer, is quite oppressive: whence the present inhabitants of Tiberias pass the night in huts of leaves or straw upon the roofs of their houses.‡ Although this warmth does not equal that of Jericho, where the wheat harvest is as far advanced by the middle of May as it is on the Lake-side by June, yet on the other hand the melons ripen here four weeks earlier than in Acco and Damascus.§ Frequent fevers, which occur to this day especially in Tiberias, pestilence and ophthalmia, as well, perhaps, as general debility, such as always found its natural home in the district of Jericho, might well have been the result from immemorial time of this peculiar close damp heat by the low lying marshy shore. Moreover all these districts suffered often enough from severe earthquakes, of which the last and most fearful took place shortly before the days of Jesus, at the time of the battle of Actium in the autumn of 31, when in Judæa and as it seems especially in the plain of Saron, between Tabor and the Lake, 10,000 persons were buried beneath the houses.||

* Burckhardt p. 564. Robinson 515.

† Burckhardt 564 (likewise Schubert loc. cit.), cf. Robinson 3, 515, 539.

‡ Cf. Strauss 412. Snow Ant. 14, 15, 4: as a curiosity by Sepphoris: *νιφόντος τοῦ θεοῦ*. Cf. Tac. H. 5, 6 on Palestine at large: *rari imbres, uber solum*.

§ Cf. Burckhardt p. 560, 564. Rob. 514.

|| Fever Matt. viii. 14, cf. [p. 13. Earthquakes Jos. Ant. 15, 5, 2. Acc. to Jerushalmi the High Priest in offering incense in the Holiest was wont to pray especially for the dwellers in Saron, that their houses might not become their grave: this Saron however was not the western one in Philistia (cf. Acts ix. 35), but that in Galilee (Hier. d. loc. Hebr.: *usque in præsentem diem regio inter montem Tabor et stagnum Tiberiadis Saronas appellatur*). That the

Comparatively speaking the most fortunate position in respect of climate was probably (as Josephus too avers) enjoyed by the land of Gennesar, it was nearer to the fanning breezes of Hermon, had the richest covering of vegetation, and abundant irrigations. These shores were of old a cultivated country. The books of the Old Testament know of the sea of Kinnereth and of the land and town of Kinnereth or Kinneroth to the north-west of the lake, which in Jesus' times though long vanished, still gave its name to the Lake.* For surely it is far more likely that the appellation lake of Gennesar, or Gennesaret, which was in use along with several other names (as Sea of Galilee, Sea of Tiberias) in his day, is due simply to a linguistic variation of the old word, and not as the subtlety of the Rabbis explains it to a new etymology "Garden of the Princes."† The earliest settlements may as Justin states have been those of the Phœnicians, and the place Kinnereth itself according to the suggestive explanation of Sepp have been a seat of worship of the Canaanitish Nature-God, Kinyras-Adonis, the inventor of the harp (Kinnor).‡ In the time of Jesus the western and more habitable shore was strewn with a long row of places, among which, however, vying with Taricheæ in its proud and strong position at the south end of the Lake, and its population of account of Jerushalmi entirely agrees with that of Josephus, is shown by Grätz 482. Cf. 480.

* Num. xxxiv. 11. Deut. iii. 17. Jos. xi. 2, 1. K. xv. 20 : the whole (Land) of Cinneroth.

† *Λίμνη Γεννησαρ* 1 Macc. xi. 67. Jos. B. J. 3, 10, 1. 7, 8. This was the "native name" § 1. *Ἰδῆρα Γεννήσαρα* Jos. Ant. 13, 5, 7. Gennesara Plin. 5, 15. *Γεννησαρίτ* Matt. xiv. 34. *λίμνη Γεννησαρίτις* Jos. Ant. 18, 2, 1. Vit. 65. Just so Strabo and Ptolem. in Winer A. Genezareth. Targums : Genesar, Gennesar, Ginnosar. The *t*-ending is scarcely due to a resuscitation of the ending of Cinnareth, but is the result of the Article, cf. Nazara. Galilæan sea Matt. iv. 18 ; xv. 29. Sea of Tiberias John vi. 1 ; xxi. 1 ; *λίμνη Τιβερις* Paus. 5, 7. The rabbinical rendering (Lightf. 2, 227) : quare vocatur Gennesar ? ob hortos principum (ganne sarim), also in Sepp Jerusal. II., 184.

‡ Just. Hist. 18, 3. Sepp II., 132. 177. 184. Cf. Jos. Ant. 19, 1, 13. Tac. H. 2, 3. In this roundabout way certainly the name may finally be connected with the Hebr. Kinnor=guitar, but not exactly with the guitar-like form of the Lake (so Rüetschi, Art. Genezareth in Herzog).

40,000, the somewhat more northerly Tiberias, the new capital of the tetrarch Antipas maintained so much the pre-eminence that it actually gave its name to the entire Lake; as it is almost the only one which has survived as a place of any consideration through all the storms of time to this day, numbering a population of about 3000 souls. Of these a quarter are Jews, who in a habitation hallowed since the destruction of Jerusalem by its Sanhedrim and Rabbinical schools, no less than Jerusalem, Hebron, and Safed,—wait for the Messiah to arise from the ripples of the Lake, while by a notable instance of providential irony the real Messiah has long since ruled over them.*

The smaller towns of Bethsaida and Chorazin, like the large-grown Taricheæ, owed their names in part to the peaceful rivalry of fishing, by which they lived.† In the present day the largest part of this favoured shore lies so waste and desert from the effect of the iron tread of the Romans, Arabs, and Turks—in fulfilment of Jesus' prediction—that it is hard work to discern here and there, amid thistles and thorns, their ruined sites, still harder to identify the same.‡

This is true, as well, of the remains of Capernaum. Before we seek them, however, it behoves us to describe more in detail the glorious and hallowed ground of the country of Gennesar, in order to draw from the prospect thus presented an ample indemnification, supposing that the spot where the town so famous in history once lay should have been lost for ever. It is no wide circle within which we have to seek for traces of the footsteps of Jesus. About a league and a half northwards from Tiberias there opens out near the now wretched village of

* Taricheæ was not named on page 7. The strength and number of inhabitants Jos. Ant. 14, 7, 3. B. J. 3, 10, 1, 10. In the Tiberias of to-day Burckhardt reckons 4000 inhabitants, 2,563, Sepp 2,000 II., 146. Cf. Furrer p. 314 ff.

† Bethsaida = Fish house (scarcely = Siddim Joshua xix. 35); Taricheæ = Pickleton, Rüetschi loc. cit. Chorazin = Korakinos, the carp fish (cf. Jos. B. J. 3, 10, 8). Sepp 194. Towns they are called Matt. xi. 20 ff. Luke x. 10 ff. John i. 44.

‡ Cf. Matt. xi. 20 ff.

Magdala, ennobled notwithstanding for all time by Magdalene, still more than by the Talmud—the ancient *Mîgdal El* (God's Tower), the modern *Medjel*—a fair plain of small extent, from which the hills, among the rest the oft-named bold nest of rocks, where thirst for freedom found a home, and hordes of robbers a shelter,—*Arbela* (at present *Irbid*), retire in a kind of curved line, a league in length, and a third of a league in breadth. It is the land of *Gennesar*, which *Josephus* describes, to-day called *El Ghuveir*, the little *Ghor*, or little plain.* The fame of the fruits of *Gennesar*, which put to shame the Market of Jerusalem, and of the Gardens of *Gennesar* in the Rabbinical writings belongs chiefly to this neighbourhood: to this day the pastures of *Menyeh* are proverbial for their richness among the dwellers in the district, and the “*Punjab*” of the five, in parts riverlike, brooks with their gushing springs, and their rich alluvial soil of unsurpassed fertility, as shown in the green meadows, the palms and the oleander blossoms—is the admiration of travellers.† But the fairest, most vividly coloured, and in truth the justest picture to ancient and modern ideals of this country has been drawn near the time of Jesus by the Jewish historian of Jerusalem, a picture for whose sake much—and most of all his silence with respect to the life of Jesus may be forgiven him: in very truth that was the ground which was worthy of Jesus, and which gives us a portrait of himself. “Along the Lake of *Gennesar*,” says *Josephus*, “extends the district of like name, wondrous in natural beauty. There is no plant whose growth it refuses to sustain, such is its fertility. The husbandmen plant everything, and the well-tempered air suits equally divers kinds. In countless quantities grows there

* *Magdala* with the *Rabb. Lightf.* 226. *Arbela*, Ἀρβήλων σπήλαιον (*Jos. Vit.* 37. *Ant.* 12, 11, 1, where town, and 14, 5, 4 where village is the appellation. Also *Jos. Vit.* 60. *Robinson* 3, 529 ff. 535 ff. *Jos. B. J.* 3, 10, 8: 30 stades by 20.

† The *Gennesar* gardens and fruits with the *Rabb. Lightf.* 2, 227. Pastures of *Menyeh*, *Burckhardt* 2, 559. Cf. again *Sepp* II., 170 ff. *Robinson* III., 529 ff. 539.

the hardy walnut tree ; but none the less the palm, which flourishes in hot climes, close to it fig and olive trees, for which a gentler temperature is fitted. A rivalry of nature, one might call it, doing violence to herself to bring together discordant elements, a noble contest of the seasons, of which each appears to claim the district for its own. For the latter not only produces contrary to expectation, the most diverse kinds of fruit, but keeps them in continuous preservation. The most royal fruits, grapes and figs, it furnishes in unbroken supply for ten months together ; as well as other kinds, which along with the afore-named ripen and mature throughout the entire year. Over and above the excellent mingling of temperature the land is watered by a verily creative spring, called by the natives Kapharnaum. Some have held it to be a branch of the Nile, since among the fishes which it produces dwells one that is like the blackfish (carp) of the Lake of Alexandria. The length of the country skirting the lake of like name is thirty stades, the breadth twenty.”*

There is a satiating power in the fresh and full perspective of this little picture, enshrining as it does the precious name of Capernaum with unmistakeable distinctness, such that we can regard almost with indifference the archæological performances, dry at the best, of those who have searched the country to find the clod of earth, on which Capernaum once stood, perhaps in its ruins is standing to this day. And yet one is sensible still when engaged with the Life of the Lord, even at a distance from the spots concerned, of something of the all consuming

* B. J. 3, 10, 8 : φιλοτιμίαν ἃν τις εἴποι τῆς φύσεως, βιασαμένης εἰς ἓν συναγαγεῖν τὰ μάχιμα καὶ τῶν ὥρων ἀγαθὴν ἔριν, ἐκάστης ὥσπερ ἀντιποιουμένης τοῦ χωρίου. Cf. p. 372 N. Ritter loc. cit. p. 292 recalls here the sentence of Hippocrates *περὶ αἰρών*, that such a *κρᾶσις* of the seasons comes nearest to perpetual spring. Cf. Rev. xxii. 2. Tac. H. 5, 6 says of Palestine *palmetis proceritas et decor*. The observation respecting the fishes of the Nile has been confirmed by Hasselquist with regard to the Lake of Gennesar : as in the former, there occur the *Silurus*, *Sparus Galilæus* (giltheads), *Mugil* (mullets) Rob. 3, 510.

interest with which a Robinson and others assure us they have followed up the traces of the long lost Capernaum.*

Fortunately, too, the facts are such that the site of Capernaum can be fixed with at all events quite overwhelming probability.

True, the mentions and descriptions of Capernaum in antiquity and even the Middle Ages afford but unstable data. Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, know indeed of a Capernaum, which they call now a town and now a village; they note its position on the Lake, near to Tiberias, Bethsaida, Chorazin; they reckon the distance from Chorazin at two Roman miles (a little more than three quarters of a league), and Epiphanius is aware that in the place in question, long inhabited exclusively by Jews, the Jewish Christian convert Joseph received permission from the Emperor Constantine to build, as also in Tiberias, Sepphoris, Nazara, a Christian Basilica, in which 600 A.D. the house of Peter was shown to Antoninus Martyr: but with all that we fail to fix the actual spot.† The later mediæval travellers are still cognizant indeed of Capernaum, which Arkulfus at the end of the seventh century describes as an unwallèd town, resting upon the mountains to the north, with a narrow site drawn out into a line between hill and lake; while again in the thirteenth century Brokardus found under that name a wretched village consisting of barely seven fisher-

* 3, 535.

† Cf. Eus. Hier. Onom. (Eus.: *ἔτι νῦν ἐστὶ κώμη*. Hier. oppidum). Hier. in Isa. ix. 1: *laeum Gen., in ejus litore Capharnaum et Tiberias et Bethsaida et Chorozaïm sita sunt*. The distance of Cap. and Chor. in the Onom. s. v. Chorozeim: *est autem nunc desertum in secundo lapide a Capharnaum*, of Beths. and Cap. Epiph., Hær. II., 437 Par. 1622: *οὐ μακρὰν—τῷ διαστήματι*. Jerome (see above), St. Willibald (8. sec.), Brokardus (13 sec.) favour the somewhat more northerly position as regards Cap. of the two other towns. Rob. seeks Beths. in Et Tabigha $\frac{1}{4}$ league north of Khan Minyeh, Chorazin in Tell Hum. The ruins Kerâzeh (some way off the Lake by Tell Hum) are not Chorazin. Seetzen sought the latter erroneously to the east of the Lake. Recently Ritter (following Seetzen) would find Bethsaida in Khan Minyeh, Chorazin in Et Tabigha p. 342. The Church Epiph. Haer. I, 4-12 p. 127-137. Anton. Martyr Itin. 7. Cf. Robinson p. 545 ff. N. Forsch. p. 467 ff. Sepp II., 179.

men's huts: but who can guarantee with perfect certainty the correctness of the name of the town and its neighbours? * Far sooner shall we reach our goal by comparing the main topographical features as we find them especially in Josephus, the situation on the Lake, in the country of Gennesar, in the grandest and best watered portion of the plain, with such traces as are to be met with on the ground to this day. By this position, Lightfoot's conjecture, who seeks for Capernaum between Tiberias and Taricheæ on the lower lake, is cut short at the outset. Only two places indeed are there which at the present time can seriously contest the honour of bearing the remains of Capernaum, and only one of them can at all make good its claim. The one is the broad ruin-covered field of Tell Hum, the other the great barrack-like mass of basaltic tufa buildings, now weather-worn, called Khan Minyeh, with some smaller remains, both on the north-west end of the Lake, somewhat more than a league distant from each other. † Khan Minyeh has been named since the twelfth century: at the beginning of the seventeenth Francis Quaresmius mentioned this place as Capernaum, and lately Robinson and Sepp, the latter by repeated examinations, corroborated this position. Tell Hum was first demonstrably brought into notice by Mich. Nau (1674), and Richard Pococke (1737), on the ground of local report, has been pointed out by Burekhardt, Seetzen, Renan, as the place usually regarded as Capernaum, and has been latterly defended as such, particularly by Wilson, Carl Ritter, Rödiger, and Ewald. ‡

* Cf. Robinson III., 548.

† Cf. Furrer's calculation p. 413. Robinson III., 542 ff. Khan = shelter, chiefly a covering for men and beasts, cf. Winer A. Herberge.

‡ Cf. Burekhardt II., 548. Renan 133. Robinson III., 541 ff. 557. In opposition to Rob. Dr. Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, 2, 143 ff. On the other side the latter biblical researches in Palestine by Robinson 1847, 456 ff. Sepp II., 173 ff. Ritter *Erdk. loc. cit.* XV., 339 ff. (following to Wilson). Ewald 225. Strauss p. 441 for K. M., Furrer p. 324 for Tell Hum. De Sauley actually took Tell Hum = Julias.

For Tell Hum,* what pleads more strongly than the name whose distant resemblance to Capernaum doubtless had the greatest weight, though from the latter the former could not easily arise—is the astonishingly grand and in Palestine almost unique ruined site. This extends half an English mile in length, a quarter of a mile in breadth along the Lake; and close to the foundation walls of ordinary dwellings, are to be seen the remains, 105 feet in length, of an unusually magnificent building composed of limestone, probably a synagogue, with a number of columns, double columns made of a single block, fine Corinthian capitals, hewn architrave, portal, and frieze full of sculptures.† But quite decisive against Tell Hum is its distance from the plain of Gennesar, beyond which it lies more than a league to the north, the absence of fresh water in this altogether desolate and dismal locality, whose surroundings are a brackish spring, a dried up wady and black volcanic heaps of stone; the lack of any favourable harbourage, and the immediate turning off of the road from the Lake inland at Minyeh.‡

For Khan Minyeh the whole situation vouches in a high degree. Here is the plain of Gennesar, and here too it leaves off, for directly north of it stretches the mountain chain which had retired in a half circle to make room for that fair district, and abuts again upon the Lake; so much so, that it is only by a narrow and difficult pathway that the rocks are artificially

* Tell Hum is explained: Hill of the Camel herd. Robinson 558. To begin with a strange name, especially as no Tell is there. Cf. Rob. N. bibl. Forsch. 467. On the other hand Rödiger, Allg. Hall. Lit. Z. 1842, p. 581 (rejecting the Camel-herd hum=haum) maintained that the word arose from Nachum and in combination with this held fast to the connexion with Capernaum. Scarcely, however, as also Sepp brings prominently forward, could *Nachum* give rise to a *Hum*; it would have to be *Num*, cf. *Κεφαρνώνη*. Tell Hum owes its name in the highest probability, as also Hitzig writes to me, (and Sepp 189 f. assumes), to a corruption of the word Tanchum, inasmuch as Rabbi Tanchum is there buried.

† Rob. 554. Sepp 188.

‡ Cf. Burckhardt 558. Rob. 556 f. Sepp 190 f.

penetrated, and the great road to Damascus on leaving the Khan strikes straight uphill and inland.* Here there is water and vegetation. Between the Khan and the shore there runs, according to Robinson, an overflowing stream of sweet water, pleasant to the taste, bursting forth impetuously from beneath the rocks, and forming a brook that after a few hundred steps hastens to the Lake.

Over this stream stands a very large fig tree, which gives its name to the fountain (Ain-et-Tin), the camping place of Burckhardt and all subsequent travellers. Close at hand are several other springs. Along the lake-side is a strip of luxuriant green, consisting of grass and clover, an emerald meadow-carpet; "no other in Palestine so green:" the shore is adorned with a tall growth of sedge. Numerous herds and flocks graze on this part of the plain; indeed it is just the pastures of Minyeh which, according to Burckhardt, have become proverbial for their richness among the dwellers in the neighbouring districts.† A good half league (thirty to forty-five minutes' walk) to the south of the Lake the supply of water is, it is true, still more abundant; here is the "Round Well" (Ain-el-Mudauwarah), enclosed by a round wall, a hundred feet in diameter, two deep, clear and sweet, welling up with great force, and breaking out into a river which waters the plain for a long way, while still nearer to the mountains the mighty Wady-er-Rubudjyeh (Rabadiyeh, the Talmudic Nachal Rebitha) rolls its torrent, which in a multitude of arms and artificial canals feeds the plain to the north and south. The basin of the Round Well, alive with countless small fish, is like a secret sanctuary thickly surrounded by trees and shrubs, most of all by nubk-trees, oleanders, and climbing reddish blue bind-weeds. The whole district is richly overgrown with bushes

* Rob. 542. 552. Neue bibl. Forsch. p. 452: the Khan lies close under the northern hill, about where the road to Damascus begins to rise.

† Rob. 541 ff. N. Forsch (supplementarily) loc. cit. Sepp 173. 180 ff. Burck. 558 f. The "carpet" in Sepp.

and grass that reaches to the height of a man.* Finally, the district of Minyeh served as a harbourage : a half circle seems to mark the harbour, which has become choked up in the lapse of time, sheltered by the mountain promontory from all the northern winds : here the wood from the east shore is still landed for Acco.† Even historical traces of the identity of the place are not so entirely absent.

The French Bishop Arkulfus (in the seventh century) gives a picture of Capernaum, of which the features as detailed above find their point of coincidence at Khan Minyeh alone.‡ Of decisive value, last of all, is the demonstration which Lightfoot had beforehand made possible, and which Sepp has now taken up, that Capernaum, according to Rabbinical statements, was called on account of its Christian inhabitants, not surely for the first time after the age of the Emperor Constantine, the town of the Minæans (Minim), the heretics and sinners.§ Indeed in the writings of the Church Fathers of the fourth century we meet also with the Jewish sect of Minæans, condemned by the Pharisees, as equivalent to the Jewish Christians or Nazaræans, and nothing hinders us from assuming that Khan Minyeh borrowed its name from the Minæans, *i.e.* from the Christians, who before and after the reign of the Emperor Constantine were settled here, perhaps had been the parent church of Galilee from the time of Jesus.|| Let us neverthe-

* Burekh. p. 559. Rob. 536 ff. N. bibl. Forsch. 451. Sepp 171 ff.

† Sepp pp. 182. 191. Robinson too speaks (neue bibl. Forsch. 453) of the little bay south of the Khan.

‡ Rob. 548. N. bibl. Forsch. 466. Cf. above p. 367.

§ Lightf. 579 : Capernaum inhabited by מניי *i.e.* miniim, deniers, heretics. Minaah=heresy. Cf. the designation of the Khan by Fürer von Haymendorf in the 10th Cent. : Mini, Reisebeschreib. Nürnberg. 1646, 276 f. Quaresmius II., 868: arabice Menieh nuncupatur.

|| Sepp II., 174 ff. Cf. Hier. August. 89: usque hodie per totas orientis synagogas inter Judæos hæresis est, quæ dicitur Minæorum et a Phariseis nunc usque damnatur; quos vulgo Nazaræos nuncupant, qui credunt in Christum. A main proof of Sepp's is the Midr. Cohel. f. 73, 1: Chanina journeyed to Capernaum: but the Minæans put a spell upon him, f. 109, 4: Sinners are the dwellers

less not be silent with respect to the difficulties of the view. Fortunately they admit of solution. A main objection to Khan Minyeh is the lack of historical remains in the form of buildings. True Quaresmius had long ago spoken of many ruins, but latterly Burckhardt had as yet seen nothing of them.* A signal importance does not belong to this objection, since millenniums have passed over the ground, and the ruined sites that do exist here and there, do not, even according to Renan, lead back so smoothly to the time of Jesus.

Now Robinson found in the year 1838 a few steps southwards from the Khan and the fountain, a slight elevation, with ruins of considerable extent: he thought them not very old, but could not definitely decide. On the other hand he discovered, about a mile and a half further south, a limestone column lying on the plain, twenty feet in length, and at least two feet in diameter.† In his journey in the year 1852, the shapeless heaps of ruins lying in the direction of the Bay seemed to him much more considerable than before, and he inferred with certainty a settlement of no small size in ancient times.‡ Sepp followed up the ruins of Khan Minyeh still further. He found distinctly the course of the town wall marked by the substructure which rose high above the earth, mostly of basaltic tufa; numerous dry cisterns, a pair of colossal basalt millstones. The extent of the ruins convinced him of the probability of that town's having numbered a few thousand inhabitants, but never more.§ Another difficulty, moreover, has not been sufficiently stated by Robinson and Sepp. Josephus describes the well of Capernaum as a stream of blessing for the whole land of Gennesar.|| But the Fig-

in Capernachum (other reading: the Minim). Galilæan communities Acts ix. 31. Cf. Jul. Afr. ap. Eus. 1, 7, but also Epiph. p. 605. 558.

* Quaresmius II., 568: in illius situ multæ ruinæ cernuntur.

† 542. 540. Renan 133.

‡ Neuere bibl. Forsch. 453.

§ P. 178 f.

|| B. J. 3, 10, 8: *πηγὴ διάρδεταί γονιμωτάτη, Καθ' αὐτὴν οἱ ἐπιχώριοι καλοῦσι.*

fountain by Khan Minyeh has not this importance after all, even though the brook that grows out of it does not a few steps further, as Robinson before said, or as Burckhardt gives it, after a few hundred steps, fall into the Lake.*

This is the main exception taken by Ritter, who, however, defends himself against the still more telling objection to the desolate Tell Hum by the wholly unlikely assumption that the brook and the place Capernaum had nothing to do with each other.† Doubtless the northern portion of the plain as far as Khan Minyeh is not so richly watered as the southern; the ground is here and there dry and parched, and thickly overgrown with thorn bushes.‡ Doubtless the fuller supply of water is in the neighbourhood of the Round Well and the river Rubudjyeh, which spreads its beneficent stream far and wide, north and south, through means of its arms and canals.§ Hence Pococke, and after him Robinson himself, first sought for Capernaum here with painful and unavailing toil.|| Under the pressure of these difficulties Robinson settled matters rather easily with Josephus. Josephus' expression, says he, may in point of fact amount to nothing more than the assertion that here in the plain there was a spring Capernaum, which "helped" to water it: so understood, the words suit as well the Fig-fountain by the Khan as the Round Fountain. In his more recent Biblical researches he has sought a second expedient. Probably, he says, Josephus thought of this spring as a well of pure drinkable water in opposition to the other, warm and brackish, fountains on the shore; but scarcely looked

So read Hav. Oberth. Dind. Robinson prefers the reading *ποτιστῆρ* (n. Forsch. 461) but this is at once excluded by the verb.

* Rob. p. 541. Now also Neue bibl. Forsch. 452. Burckhardt p. 558. Ritter 339 kept to the "few steps."

† P. 339 ff. On the contrary Robinson too now Neue bibl. Forsch. 461.

‡ Rob. 540. In the Neue bibl. Forsch. he believes that a still visible aqueduct used to bring abundant water to this part.

§ Rob. p. 536 ff. Cf. Neue bibl. Forsch. p. 452, according to which Wady Rub. is a continuation of Wady Sellameh.

|| 537. 546. Pococke held this place to be it, Ritter p. 331 f.

to it for the origin of the plain's fertility.* Allowing that Josephus calls the fountain Capernaum exclusively the life-spring of the country, which really holds good neither of the Fig-fountain nor of the Round Well, but only of the river Rubudjyeh; yet we may find it, upon the other hand, not inconceivable that Josephus, himself a stranger in this neighbourhood, in view of the splendid water-springs of Khan Minyeh, should have deceived himself in regard to the ultimate and supreme dispenser of blessing to the country round, just as the careful Palestinian traveller Robinson first regarded the Round Fountain as the starting-point of a mighty arm of the Rubudjyeh and his predecessors again confounded the various arms themselves in all sorts of manners.† It thus remains, all things considered, in the highest degree probable that the quiet site of Khan Minyeh, at the north-western end of the Lake, somewhat over two leagues south of the focus of the Lake, where the Jordan flows in, a league and a half, or in a straight line, a good league to the north of Magdala, about three leagues from the chief town Tiberias, was that spot in the territory of Naphthali's northern tribe, so fraught with mighty issues in the history of the world, where the preaching of Christianity and the mission of Jesus had their rise.‡

* 546 Neue bibl. Forsch. p. 460 f. He here lays stress on the fact that the Fig Fountain in consequence of the advance of the waters of the Lake which there seems to unite with it, receives the fishes of the Lake (carp fish), which would be impossible in the case of the inland lying Round Fountain. Cf. p. 366 and 372 note.

† Rob. 536, 537, 540. Also cf. the non-acquaintance of Josephus with the origin of the name Capharnaum, which itself again betrays the casual glance of the stranger.

‡ Cf. Matt. iv. 13. If the Migdal El in Joshua xix. 38 is with Gesenius to be taken as identical with Magdala, of course the somewhat more northerly Capernaum must belong to the tribe of Naphthali, to which in Joshua loc. cit. along with Migdal Chammath (Emmans) and Rakkat (both together forming Tiberias) and Cinnereth i.e. nearly the whole west shore is reckoned. Acc. to Jos. Ant. 5, 1, 22: Ζαβ. μίχρη Γεννησαρ. the tribe of Zebulon must have possessed the S.W. Lake of Gennesar. Distance of the Khan from the N. end of the Lake, 2 leagues $\frac{1}{2}$ mile, from Tiberias 2 leagues 2 miles to $2\frac{1}{2}$ m. Cf. Furrer, p. 413.

If here, where our faith was cradled, in a place which in comparison with Jerusalem has so sunk into the background, that the pilgrim train of faithful souls bound only for the place of burial, rushes indifferent past the forgotten source of the words of eternal life; if here we say the future in accordance with the wish expressed in Sepp's Book of Pilgrimage, (side by side with which, however, go Renan's proposals for Nazara) shall build in gratitude a Christian Church over the ancient walls, which shall mirror itself in the Lake, and aspire heavenwards, it will perform an act of piety which, though he could well dispense with it, is an expression of our sentiment, which would not merely feed on his death, but likewise live from his life; not in conflict, as in the Church of the sepulchre, but in the harmony of all confessions, building together the long-promised Temple of the time to come, in which the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.*

The settlement of Jesus in Capernaum; this fact summed up in two words is a history in itself, indeed an entire biography, because it describes by anticipation his whole future career, and corroborates or supplies the lack as the case may be, of historical information concerning his life. It is all this, because the simple fact is a clear token, shedding lustre far and wide.

We must measure this fact by the form of the preaching of the Kingdom, as it had originated and been dissipated in these latter times on the bank of the lower Jordan. John in the terrible wilderness, Jesus in the Garden of God, in the "Land of Paradieses," and one might almost say, of the heavenly Jerusalem come down to earth.† John in the stillness of the desert, Jesus amid the turmoil of men, and in the very focus not only of the lake country but of the whole of Galilee.‡ John in his

* Cf. Sepp p. 181. Renan p. 28.

† The Land of Gennesar described by the Rabbis as *locus vicinus Tiberiadi*, in quo sunt horti et paradisi. Aruch in Lightf. 227. Rev. xxii. 2 cf. p. 359, 366.

‡ Indeed this "best district of Galilee" (Ant. 18, 2, 3) appears even quite apart from the new court of Tiberias as the central point of Galilee as early as the wars, Cf. Ant. 12, 11, 1 (Arbela), 14, 7, 3. B. J. 3, 10, 4 ff. (Taricheæ); even so in the

position of severance from priests, princes, and governors, from Rome and from Jerusalem, Jesus in the commercial and garrison town, hard by Tiberias, with its courtiers and its prophet-murdering Idumæan court.* These are clear plain contrasts and contradictions, which at one time excite our admiration, at another, perplex us. And it is easy to enlarge them to the most distant perspective, and to set down the history of Jesus apart from history, guided by this one token, in its main features of disparity from that of John. Such a ministry will display no prophet garb; in this busy rush of life, in this vicinity to Tiberias there is no place for it; but rather the plain and modest attire of the people.† It will develop no fasting, no severance from the world, for here both are forbidden by nature and civil intercourse. It will organize no retreats from society, even though from time to time it will seek solitude, and no baptismal covenants, even though the fountains gush, and Jordan and the Lake alluringly career along: for this Master has drawn nigh to men, and seeks not to tear them either from themselves or from their princes. These are the actual facts of the subsequent life of Jesus, and most of all are the three Gospels at one as against the fourth, in maintaining that Jesus so long as he was in Galilee, *i. e.*, so long as he laboured at all, did not baptize, but spoke of the Baptism of John only as a thing of the past.‡

By this peculiarity which pervaded his public appearance, and which found to some extent in his settlement at Capernaum an embodiment of its principles, Jesus before all things else declared his resolution, in spite of all points of connexion to sunder his ministry from that of John, with all its stumbling-blocks, its misunderstandings and liabilities to misunderstand-

transactions of Josephus with the Galilæans which he localized at Arbela Vit. 60. Cf. p. 9.

* *Locus vicinus Tiberiadi, Aruch in Lightf. 227.*

† Cf. Matt. ix. 20.

‡ Cf. *Gesch. Christus* Ed. 3, p. 24. Also Weizsäcker p. 333 (in spite of John): he had entirely given up baptizing. That he at his departure instituted baptism in another sense, see *Gesch. Chr.* 24.

ing. Was it haply a mere stroke of policy, intended to put those who were baiting the Kingdom of God off the scent, by making a show of peace, where no peace was, or was the preaching of that Kingdom, through fear of persecution fallen so far below its first estate, that in place of the sharp edge which could not be brooked from John, it was brought by dint of time and the spirits of men to incline to a compromise with poor reality, to acknowledge and commend the actual state of affairs, and proclaim nothing but fair smooth things, naught else but peace and love? No! it was the fresh, new, genuine, supreme Religion itself which thus settled down in Capernaum, the new spirit which lived in Jesus, in contradistinction from that of Judæism, and even that of John. Upon the genuinely Jewish ground of the blending of spiritual and earthly ordinance, John had sought for the moral empire of God in a breach with existing order, and in the building up of a new external constitution of God's people; again, on Jewish foundations, on the basis of an endless conflict between the Law of Good and Evil, he found salvation for the inner insatiate world of spirits in retirement from himself, in forceful, fasting, bleeding rupture with all that was natural, such as he imposed in part even on the people; but with full consistency upon himself and his disciples. To this religion of an infinite rupture, the settlement in Capernaum opposes with the palpable distinctness of a first word that could dispense with words—that of a blissful peace, and of a peaceful lodgment and naturalization in the world. The Religion of Jesus, which established itself in Capernaum, was before all things *that* Religion which could look with indifference beyond and above all existing conditions, even the eminence of princeſ; careless of all worldly relations, changes, and catastrophes, because it found the necessities of men, together with their satisfaction,—the true immeasurable spiritual cosmos, which no Herod could either give or take away, in the human heart and consciousness. The Religion of Jesus was, moreover, *that* Religion which could agree, nay, fraternize with

existing conditions, a friend of Nature and of Nature's every gift, which from the glories of creation caught but a loftier mood ; a visitant of men, who in every soul, concealed or unconcealed, beheld a pearl, and could find out in every honourable earthly calling suggestive hints of the heavenly Kingdom. The Religion of Jesus finally was that religion, by which alone this indifference about the things of the world, and this loving leaning towards them, could be displayed, because it was not in the first place a religion of rupture, of ruth, and of conflict, but as it primarily appeared enfolded in the sunny spirit of Jesus himself—the religion of peace, of joy, of harmony, of restful self-assurance, and of blissful contact with God ; in the eyes of which this earth, spite of all drawbacks, could smile and mirror heaven, and in presence of which the surging world within with all its contradictions and reproaches, in view of the mighty fundamental fact of the mercy and the love of God, must lay itself to rest. This new religion might well in all sobriety plant itself in the focus of Galilee, because it was able to conquer all Galilee and all the world : this religion might restfully behold the hottest rivalry and the most peaceful compact of a great Godlike Nature spread out beneath its feet, because it could show for all the contrasts of spiritual life, of which it was the fairest flower, a happy issue ; and for all its energies an infinite and a worthy arena.

The fourth Gospel has pictured the marriage at Cana in Galilee as the counterpart to the sojourn of Jesus with John. This narrative is literally and historically, as we have already seen, and shall see more and more, not a little doubtful, but it is a lovely portrait, if it has merely the purpose, which so many tokens afforded by this Evangelist conspire to assign to it, of a pictorial materialization of this great life in its entirety, nay, of the life in Capernaum. The settlement in Galilee, in the busy Capernaum, by the laughing lake, among the flowers, among men, instead of in the wilderness of Jericho or Ai, which the grudge of the Jewish narrative is so kind as to concede to

Jesus ; that was the marriage in Cana renewed from day to day, and lasting as long as ever his foot trod the earth, and his clear joyous eye was open to the world of God.

So wholly another than the Baptist, he was yet a repetition of the Baptist : his first call, which Matthew alone preserves in its unaltered form, was the original kindling call of John the Baptist : "Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."* With this call alone did he keep up his connexion with the Messianic movement, and thus in a certain sense not only invoked the afflux of the populace, with whom he soon passed as the risen Baptist, but courageously and resolutely challenged the suspicion of the ruler of the land which in so many other respects he allayed ; yet he proved at the same time that his reverence for John was inexhaustible, and that his fundamental thought of a new moral and divine order in the world held irrefragably good for ever.

III.—THE GREAT YEAR IN THE WORLD'S HISTORY.

A single authority undertakes to fix the year of the public appearance of Jesus with precision, namely the third Gospel. For the note of time which the fourth Gospel incidentally furnishes in connexion with the commencement of Jesus' work, viz. the forty-six years' duration of the building of the Temple by Herod, would, even were we justified in fixing the termination of this series as the current year, lead us in spite of the agreement with Luke to a very doubtful, nay, to an unavailable date, namely about 27 A.D. at which time Jesus did not teach, and the Roman Procurator, call him Valerius Gratus or Pilate, can scarcely have been engaged in the building of the Temple.† A second statement of the same Gospel with

* Matt. iv. 17. Mark i. 15 is watered and dogmatized. Cf. *Gesch. Chr.* 3rd Ed. p. 24. Also Weizsäcker 314 : repeated in Mark "with some illustration." The more particular meaning and conception in the mouth of Jesus must be later analysed.

† Since Herod's building of the temple began (Vol. I. p. 237) c. 734 A.U.C. or 20 B.C. (18th year of Herod), one would get the year 780=27 A.D. (Ewald p. 117,

regard to the age of Jesus as not yet fifty years old, leads us to no result, if only because there are no limits to this age.* Luke himself seems to open several roads to an accurate computation, one mediately, from the birth of Jesus downwards, reckoning about 30 years, and the other directly by a statement of the year of the Roman Emperor's reign, which coincided with the public appearance of the Baptist and of Jesus. We enter upon the latter path, because the former, both in its *terminus a quo* and *ad quem* offers after all no more than indefinite round numbers, and in virtue of the discrepancies of the writer would lead us somewhere near the year now 27 and now 37, both impossibilities: since Luke himself finally lays the greatest stress on his imperial chronology by which the Church at large was also wholly guided.†

also Wieseler Chron. P. 165 f.: 20 B.C.—28 A.D.). But with regard to the Procurators' building at the Temple, which one would then have to presuppose, not a syllable is narrated in history, and least of all does one see with Ewald anything of building activity on the part of Pilate (p. 118), which is not proved by his laying on of water. I cannot help thinking—either the writer calculated for himself the years as far as the chronological point given him by Luke whose Gospel lay before him; or later times (about and after 70) reckoned 46 years for the building of the Temple. These result pretty nearly if one reckons the conjecturally actual years of building from 20 B.C. (beginning) to 65 A.D. (Agrippa II.). For the actual finishing of the Temple building was not until 65 A.D. Ant. 20, 9, 7 (cf. § 5, 11, 1). Were we to reckon together the 8 building years of Herod the Great with say 10 of Archelaos, under whom the building impulse may have awakened afresh, and about 28 of Agrippa I. (from 37 A.D.), his brother Herod, and his son Agrippa II., the number 46 would result. After the time of Agrippa I. the *ἐπιμέλεια τοῦ ἱεροῦ* was consigned by the Romans to the Herodians, either already from 39-40 or more likely from 41 under Claudius cf. Ant. 19, 6, 1 f. 7, 2, 20, 1, 3, 5, 2, 8, 11, 9, 1, 7. Cf. also the Temple doors, Vol. 1. p. 276. Were one to reckon say 16 years for Herod G. (8 years for main buildings, 8 years until his death for secondary buildings), and 24 for the later Herodians (since 41), which is proximately the likeliest and most reliable, then we should have 40 years.

* Cf. p. 201. One neither knows whether he was 40 or 50 years old nor the exact time before or after.

† The starting point is indefinite, if one lays Luke's notice as a foundation: born under King Herod (i. 5); in which year then actually? The goal is indefinite, because the age of Jesus when appearing publicly (and according to the opening history of John as well) is only reckoned at about 30 years (iii. 23). But if we take 30 years as our foundation, which of course Wieseler does (Syn. 126, 204 and

In the 15th year of the reign of the Emperor Tiberius, so Luke relates, under the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate, when Herod (Antipás) was tetrarch of Galilee, Philip of Ituræa and Trachonitis, Lysanias of Abilene, lastly under the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, John, and immediately after him Jesus, came publicly forward.* He thus lands us at once in the year dating from the 19th of August 781-782 A.U.C. or August 28-29 A.D. In this year too there actually reigned or lived the majority of the figures who compose this time-table, Herod Antipas, Philip, Annas, Caiaphas, and Pontius Pilate.† But on this reckoning notwithstanding no full reliance can be placed, carefully as it seems to be drawn up: first of all, surely, if for no other reason, because the later writer could hardly have been more equal to the task of deciding the question of time than was the earlier Matthew who preferred to shirk it. But the main objection is constituted by the fact, which may easily be established, that John the Baptist shortly before the year 36 A.D. was cast into prison and died, and that the ministry and fate of the Baptist, with which the appearance of Jesus so closely hangs together, cannot possibly be stretched over a series of from 7 to 8 years, (28-35 A.D.).

If forsooth the modern wind-and-weather-makers Wieseler and Lichtenstein, following in the wake of former writers, are pleased to push the 15th year of Tiberius further back, reckoning not from the beginning of his independent reign, (August A.D. 14, A.U.C. 767) but from his co-regency with Augustus (Jan. A.D. 12, A.U.C. 765), then by such a fashion of computation which according to Wieseler would make the appearance of John fall in that case as early as 26 A.D., that of Jesus 27 A.D., his death as soon as 30 A.D.; they have thoroughly done

elsewhere), and the last year of Herod, counting downwards from this we get the year 27 A.D., and again counting downwards from the Taxing of Quirinius in which the birth of Jesus ii. 1 is placed (see p. 114) we get the year 37 A.D.

* Luke iii. 1.

† Cf. Vol. I. p. 260 ff.

away with every historical probability.* With more fidelity to Luke, but also with far too much faith, most writers including Wurm, and again more recently Ewald and Renan, have fixed as the year of the public appearance of the Baptist and Jesus, —and Lichtenstein at all events as that of Jesus—the year 28-29 A.D.†

To decide on an attitude of prudent reserve even towards the unmauled chronology of Luke is all the easier when we consider that the same writer not only elsewhere in the narrative of the birth of Jesus as well as in the speech of Gamaliel in the early days of the Apostolic Church betrays notable errors, but even in the time-table now before us blunders again and again.‡ Why, he speaks of an entrance of the Baptist on his ministry under the High Priest Annas, whose tenure of office he actually extends to Apostolic times, whereas in point of fact Annas had lost the High Priesthood as early as the year 14, and since this time had had four successors! If after all he mentions, along with Annas, Caiaphas, the real High Priest of the years 18-36, and is so far to be excused for

* Formerly Wieseler Chron. Synops. d. vier Ev. p. 197, had found in Luke's datum an indication of the Baptist's imprisonment: as this view was after all too much against the text, the new way has been devised of pushing further back the Baptist's ministry: maulings of the letter in the interests of the letter, since the death of Jesus according to Luke and John must be made to fall in the year 30. Lichtenstein, Herzog VI., 593 f. Wieseler, Herzog's Supplem. A. Zeitrechnung, p. 546 f. Similarly before Clericus, Lardner, Fritzsche cf. Anger Rat. Temp. 14 f. Meyer, Comm. on Gal. ii. 1. Fritzsche too makes Jesus arise already in 26. Excellently well again, especially by Wieseler, is the autumn 779 (26 A.D.) asserted as the time of the rising of the Baptist, the beginning, it is said, of the Sabbatical year. Other fables about the time of the imprisonment and death of John see below.

† Cf. my Gesch. Chr. p. 236 f. Ewald Gesch. Chr. 116 f. Renan 94, 113.

‡ Luke ii. 1 (cf. p. 114 ff.) and Acts v. 36, where Gamaliel in his famous speech (in the third decade) mentions Theudas the mover of sedition, who according to history did not arise until 44-46 after Christ, and yet again places the rising of Jndas Galilæus *after* Theudas, whereas the former arose 7 years after Christ! I say nothing here of the vain expedients of a second earlier Theudas, who never existed. It is among the signs of the times that Wieseler's identification of Theudas with the Lawyer Matthias p. 188 met with the approval of Baumgarten, Hofmann, Lichtenstein, Köhler and Lange. The foolhardiness of this opinion must be clear to every one who can read.

dragging in Annas, that the latter was even afterwards held in esteem, and was father-in-law to the former, yet for the prominence given to Annas and his distinction by the name of High Priest, *i.e.*, in plain words for the sheer historical blunder there is no justification.* Still more grossly does he blunder in his designation of the tetrarchs. Apart from the fact that he names Antipas only Herod and the first province of Philip Ituræa, whereas this mountain land of Antilibanus is never mentioned by Josephus among Philip's titles, and with Tacitus appears as the possession of a native dynasty; in the third tetrarch Lysanias of Abilene, we have neither more nor less than a non-existent person imported through an unfortunate misunderstanding of a later age.† For there never was but one historical Lysanias of Abilene, the son of the Dynast

* The succession of High Priests (cf. Vol. I. p. 261) was Annas, Ishmael Phabi, Eleazar b. Anna, Simon Kamithi, Joseph Caiaphas. Cf. p. 385 note. Luke always mentions Annas in the first rank: Annas the High Priest and Caiaphas Acts iv. 6; v. 21 ff. Gosp. iii. 2. True Annas still lived and was in repute, especially as together with his son-in-law Caiaphas a series of his sons were made High Priests, cf. Jos. Ant. 20, 9, 1. John xviii. 13, 24. But *High Priest* was Caiaphas only as Matt. and Jos. equally maintain. Wieseler has here recourse (Chron. Syn. p. 100) to the expedient of making Annas Nasi of the Sanhedrim. Pity only that Luke everywhere, even in the case of Synedria, puts the High Priestly office prominently forward.

† Philip is called by Josephus Tetrarch of Trachonitis Ant. 18, 5, 4 or of Batanæa, Trachonitis and Auranitis Ant. 17, 11, 4. 18, 4, 6. B. J. 2, 12, 8. Ituræa (cf. Gen. xxv. 15. 1 Chron. i. 31) is not named. This mountain land of Antilibanon (to-day Jedur) was subjugated by King Aristobolus Ant. 13, 11, 3 and in the service of Herod the Great's court is Soëmus the Ituræan 15, 6, 5 ff. (executed). But at that time the land was independent, and was since Antony (cf. Dio C. 49, 32, Wieseler Syn. p. 179) who made Lysanias King of the Ituræans, a kingdom by itself, whose piecemeal division after the murder of Lysanias (36 B.C.) Jos. and Dio (see next page), and whose extinction with the death of King Soëmus Tacitus records simultaneously with the extinction of the kingdom of Agrippa under the year 49 A.D. Ann. 12, 23. At the time of the Jewish war there is again a King Soëmus *περὶ τὸν Λιβανὸν τετραρχῶν* Jos. Vit. 11; B. J. 3, 4, 2; 7, 1: but more to the north in the Syrian Emesa, successor to Sampsigeram and Azizus. Cf. in the footsteps of Münter, Winer, Eless in Pauly. A. Ituræa. In exculpation of Luke it might be urged that Ituræa was at any rate according to Dio C. 49, 32 the collective name of the kingdom of Lysanias, of which a large part fell to Herod and then to Phil. (cf. also B. J. 2, 2, 3) Vol. I. p. 233, 253.

Ptolemy Mennæus of Chalkis-Abilene, the king of Ituræa, who about the year 36 B.C. was murdered by Antony in Cleopatra's honour and interest.*

Afterwards this district was always called the "former" or "so-called" tetrarchate or kingdom of Lysanias, but had no longer any master whatever of that name, of whom none but theologians out of regard for Luke still continue to fable; but belonged to the Romans and was by them farmed or given away piecemeal, as by Antony to Cleopatra's children, by Augustus to Herod, by Caligula and Claudius to his grandchildren and great-grandchildren; the two Agrippas to begin with.†

Let us not deny spite of all the palpable mistakes of the writer, that in this his difficult task of settling the date he did not stray very wide of the truth after all. To sum up we may

* B. J. 1, 13, 1. Ant. 13, 6, 1. 16, 3. 14, 3, 2. 7, 4. Murdered 15, 4, 1. Dio C. 49, 32.

† B. J. 2, 11, 5: βασιλείαν τοῦ Λυσανίου λεγομένην Ant. 20, 7, 1: Λυσανίου δὲ αὕτη ἐγεγόνει τετραρχία. Soon after the death of Lysanias Zenodorus appears as Farmer of the House (Land) of Lysanias, (the Letter of the lease is Rome: so also Eless) B. J. 1, 21, 4, Ant. 15, 10, 1 ff. Then he was obliged in obedience to the mandate of Octavianus (24 B.C.) to give up one after the other Trachon, Batanæa, Auranitis to Herod the G. Ant. 15, 10, 1 f. B. J. 1, 21, 4: and after the death of Zenodorus (ab. 21 B.C.) Herod received in addition important pieces of his possession between Trach. and Galilee Ant. 15, 10, 3 cf. Vol. I. p. 233. Yet not all, for Soëmus was ruling in Ituræa (Ann. 12, 23) and Caligula (37) and Claudius (41) afterwards added to Agrippa the remaining nucleus of the Λ. λεγομένη βασιλεία (especially Abila) besides what his grandfather had had Ant. 18, 6, 10. 19, 5, 1. 20, 7, 1. B. J. 2, 11, 5. Chalcis was got by Agrippa's brother Herod A.D. 41 (19, 5, 1), then by Agrippa II. from 48-52 (20, 7, 1), afterwards by Aristobulus, probably Herod's son, (7, 7, 1). On grounds that are no grounds at all Winer, Hug, Kuhn, Krabbe, Meyer, Tholuck, Wieseler (also A. Abilene) have defended the existence of a later Lysanias under Tiberius and Caligula. The most important point is: (1) that even afterwards mention is only made of a former and so called dominion of Lysanias. (2) The Lysanias of the time of Antony is called now Tetrarch, now King, and accordingly is not to be separated from a so called Tetrarch of after times, cf. the above passages, also Ant. 14, 7, 4. 12, 1, 3, 1. 15, 4, 1. B. J. 1, 13, 1. (3) To him along with Chalcis Abila too had already belonged Ant. 20, 7, 1. Thus it was not afterwards as is alleged (Meyer) that a specific Dynast of Abilene arose. (4) If there were such a later dynasty, it must by preference have been that of Soëmus (rex Ituræorum Tac. loc. cit).

say he probably was only about five years out of his reckoning, and if we assume that tradition marked out for him the reign of Tiberius as the time of the preaching of John and Jesus, we shall see that he pardonably supplemented a correct statement by an hypothesis which only found its place a little too far towards the middle of the age of Tiberius instead of towards its end.

Thus left destitute of New Testament authorities we would willingly seek counsel of the Fathers of the Christian Church as to the year of Jesus. But they themselves have drawn exclusively on the chronology of Luke, and by no means improved it. As a rule they regard the 15th year of Tiberius as at once the year of the *début* and the death of Jesus : but sometimes they have sought to mediate between Luke and John, who instead of one year of teaching for Jesus seemed to record three ; and have made Jesus labour either from the year 15-18 of Tiberius, (28-31 A.D.), or even from 12 to 15, *i.e.*, 25-28.*

We find our position improved not indeed by later Jewish and Talmudic statements which have mingled fables and correct reminiscences together, but by the historian of the Jewish people, Josephus, although the fact must remain, that all his knowledge of Jesus is summed up in silence.

Nothing in the world is so certain as that Jesus, taking the widest limits of his labours, was at work solely and entirely between the years 33-35 of our reckoning. To the rear this reckoning is fixed by the fact that John the Baptist very shortly before the year 36 met his death in prison, so that for his meteor-like appearance only the years immediately preceding are left us ; and secondarily, by the fact of the Messianic movement in Samaria in the year 35, which presupposes him to have been at work about the year 33-34, with a high degree of

* Gesch. Chr. 237. How does Ewald p. 117 stretch the framework of these limits, when he puts 5 years for John and Jesus 28-33.

probability. To the front this date is irrefragably settled by the fact that the judges of Jesus, Pontius Pilate, *before* Easter of 36, and the High Priest Joseph Caiaphas *in* the Easter of 36, were deposed by a stronger hand, namely by the general plenipotentiary of the East, the Governor of Syria, Lucius Vitellius, so that the death of Jesus must have taken place at latest in the Easter of 35.* With the assured discovery of the half decade in which the activity of the Baptist and Jesus fell, one might be quite content: it is after all a firm standing ground, and a segment of time, whose living individuality of outline may be described with tolerable precision. Nevertheless it is at all events worth the trial to see whether the year of Jesus may not be defined still more exactly.

It is the same Josephus who by his compilation of the whole history of the time might, by means of the same figures who are actors in our history, cause a clear light to shine. The attempt has long since been made, most of all by accurate

* Thus already Schrader, *Paulus*, 1, 7. 23, has calculated the deposition of Pilate and Caiaphas. Also Wieseler. *Synops.* p. 184. Ewald, on the contrary, *Gesch. Christus*, p. 33, puts the deposition of Caiaphas 37 A.D. The proof of the contrary is easily given. Josephus mentions a threefold interference of Vitellius, the Governor of Syria, who according to Tac. *Ann.* 6, 32, in the year 35 (C. Cestio, M. Servilio coss.) cunctis, quæ apud orientem parabantur præfectus est. (1) Deposition of Pilate, and substitution of Marcellus, *Ant.* 18, 4, 2. (2) Somewhat later his march to Jerusalem at the Feast of the Passover, deposition of Caiaphas, raising of Jonathan, son of Annas, 18, 4, 3. (3) Somewhat later, march to Jerusalem on the expedition against the kingdom of Petra, celebration of the feast, deposition of Jonathan, raising of Theophilus, son of Annas, 18, 5, 3. From this journey we must reckon. At Jerusalem on the fourth day of Vitellius' presence there arrived the news of the death of the Emperor Tiberius († 16 March, 37 A.D.). It was therefore most likely Easter, scarcely Whitsuntide, of 37, and by no means (as Ewald thinks) the Autumnal Feast of 37, especially as Vitellius moreover could only have undertaken his campaign against Petra in the spring, not in the autumn. Thus Jonathan, the successor of Caiaphas, was deposed Easter 37. Thus the previous sojourn in Jerusalem with its deposition of Caiaphas fell on Easter 35 or 36. But it fell on Easter 36, because Vitellius only set foot in Syria in the year 35, and because before he had set foot in Judæa he had administered Judæa from his seat in Syria, heard the complaints of the Samaritans and deposed Pilate. Thus finally the deposition of Pilate fell in the summer or autumn of 35, or at latest the winter 35-36.

observation of the notices which Josephus affords partly concerning the Baptist and partly concerning the marriage of Antipas with Herodias. Yet Winer has declared that a really probable result has not yet been furnished.

I have before without knowledge of my predecessors been of the opinion that with fair consideration such is nevertheless to be found.* The fixed point from which every computation has to start, not to speak of what tells us so much, the Samaritan rising of the year 35, has already been hinted at. This is the disastrous battle between the generals and armaments of the tetrarch Antipas, and the Arabian king Aretas, the natural consequence of the adulterous contumely with which the former treated the daughter of the latter, for many years his consort and sacrificed by him to Herodias: and at the same time the consequence and the penalty of his cruel execution of the dauntless denouncer of his new marriage with Herodias, the prophet John—as the religious verdict of Israel plainly enough declared.† This battle fell in the summer or autumn of the year 36, inasmuch as the Governor of Syria, Vitellius, in compliance with the express mandate of the Emperor Tiberius, to whom his protégé Antipas pleaded his distress, after the most hasty preparations in the spring of 37, opened the campaign against Aretas, but on the news of Tiberius' death († 16 March, 37) while the feast at Jerusalem was still being held, again put a stop to the same. Fortunately

* So Lamy and van Til (1710), Schrader, Paul. 1, 36 ff., Anger, Wieseler (Synops. p. 238 ff.). Cf. Winer, Real-Wörterb. Art. Johannes d. Täufer and Herodes Antipas. My calculation, which is here recapitulated and further corroborated, Gesch. Christus, p. 226 ff. With such vague objections as some reviewers deal in, even Baxmann, Theol. Stud. 1867, estimating the measurements of time and the intervals just as it suits their convenience or their requirements, I do not care to concern myself. Already Wieseler too speaks. p. 240, of *causal* rather than *temporal* connexion in Josephus. An example of apparent proximity of punishment he calls Ant. 20, 8, 5. I would still rather mention, Just. Ap. 1, 32.

† Ant. 18, 5, 2 (init. et fin.). Aretas (cf. Winer) = the Plowman, Arab. Charith, Hebr. Choresch (Communication of Schrader's) Renan 110: Hâreth.

on this question earlier and later writers are at one, in opposition to whom however Ewald, merely for the sake of approximating to Luke's chronology in defiance of all historical landmarks, refers the battle to the year 34.*

If the battle fell in the year 36, then the execution of John, which was followed by the defeat as a divine judgment like that which avenged Onias, must have taken place but one or two years previously at most, between 34-36, and the short ministry of the Baptist, with his short imprisonment, cannot well reach beyond the year 33 A.D., in which however Ewald and Renan would have it that not only John, but Jesus himself was dead.†

Perhaps we come somewhat nearer yet to the historical fact, if the beginning of the war—nearest if the beginning of Antipas' connexion with Herodias—admits of being fixed yet more precisely. The beginning of the new union of Antipas, and that of the game of war, are closely enough linked not only with each other but also with the imprisonment of John, inasmuch as he is fast in the fortress which Antipas can only have won from his father-in-law at the beginning of the war, and inasmuch as when there with all the power of prophetic candour he attacked the second disgraceful marriage as a recent fact.‡

* Ant. 18, 5, 1-3. The year 36 is also assumed by Winer, Gams (Johannes der Täufer im Gefängniss, 1853, p. 276), Wieseler Syn. 239 and others. See my Gesch. Christ. p. 227 f.

† To speak with Winer of an ample duration of the imprisonment or of John's ministry is a sorry resource in view of all the facts, particularly of Antipas' resolve, πολὺ κρείττον ἡγείται—προλαβὼν ἀναρῆν, Ant. 18, 5, 2. Even Lichtenstein only assumes as the limits of the Baptist's durance; Tabernacles 28—Easter 29; Wieseler indeed only from about March (Purim) till Easter (April) 29. Cf. my Gesch. Chr. p. 227 ff. where the rapid succession of all these incidents is sufficiently proved. Ewald p. 116. Renan p. 337 ff. Strikingly like is the divine judgment on the stoners of Onias (about 65 B.C.) Ant. 14, 2, 1 f. Even the desired παραχρῆμα.

‡ Of the latter there is no doubt, while the former appears with certainty from Ant. 13, 5, 1-2, since corrections of the text or interpretations in Ewald's sense will not possibly do. Cf. my Gesch. Christus, p. 233 f.

The commencement of the quarrel and the war is placed by Josephus not long before the decisive battle. The quarrel begins forthwith with the arrival of the dishonoured, but to the surprise of Antipas quickly and craftily escaped princess, at her father's residence in Petra. To the sense of injury was assimilated an already pending dispute of territory: forces are mustered with Oriental rapidity; the war is entered on, and issued at once in the decisive battle.*

Of this the historian's delineation we shall indeed no longer recognise a trace in the representation of Wieseler and Ewald. The former puts the imprisonment of the Baptist in the beginning of the year 29, the war not till the year 36: the latter cannot but think, that between both princes and Rome many negotiations first passed to and fro, and that finally after some years, when all negotiations were exhausted, the matter came to arms. Truly by such forced prolongations even Ewald might easily drag down the trial of arms to long after the year 34, assumed by him, even as far as our own and the genuine historical year 36.†

Moreover, the whole historical surroundings of the quarrels between the two princes assign the latter quite overwhelmingly to the years 35-36. The narrative of these disputes is preceded by the entrance of Vitellius into Syria (35 A.D.), the recall of Pilate (35-36), the deposition of Caiaphas (Easter 36), the Parthian undertakings (35-36); a moment later follows the Arabian conflict, the battle of the year 36, and the relinquished campaign of 37.‡ Only one event of somewhat earlier time is

* Ant. 18, 5, 1.

† Wieseler Syn, 223, 239. Ewald, p. 48-49. Cf. Gams, p. 59. My Gesch. Christ. 231 f.

‡ Vitellius in the East Tac. Ann. 6, 32 (in connexion with a Parthian embassy in Rome under the Consulate of C. Cestius, M. Servilius = 35 A.D.). According to the context Vitellius must have come there about the middle of the year. He was relieved about 40 A.D. by Petronius. Jos. Ant. 18, 8, 2. The Parthian incidents up to the peace negotiations of Vitellius and Antipas with Artabanus fall acc. to Tac. Ann. 6, 31-38, 41-44 (cf. Suet. Calig. 14. Vitell. 2) and Jos. Ant. 18, 4, 4-5, in the years 35-36. The chronology of the rest of the events see above.

interposed after the Parthian occurrences and before the Arabian conflict, the death of the tetrarch Philip and the occupation and organization of this country by the Romans between 33-35.* We are certainly reckoning with large figures and on no petty scale, if having regard to this isolated notice, we put back the beginnings of and preparations for the struggle mentioned by Josephus along with the seizing of the fortress of Machærus as far as the year 33-34. Schrader and Gams have fixed the year 34.†

The commencement of the union of Antipas with Herodias is assigned by Josephus himself to the same point of time, and the freshness of the rancour of Herodias against the speedy rebuker of her marriage, as exhibited by the Gospels, allows for the marriage no very wide area before the revengeful act of John's murder (between 34-36).

From the history of Herodias, from the history of Antipas, from the history of his brother-in-law Agrippa I., Herodias' brother, who was afterwards king, the clues to the commencement of this union may perhaps be still more clearly unravelled.

In the story of Herodias' life we come to no result, by proposing to ourselves such a question as that of her age and the possibility of her making an impression upon Antipas. She was in the year 34 at all events more than forty, but one or two years more or less make no difference, and the gift of charming does not depend so absolutely on age.‡ On the other

* Death of Philip according to Jos. Ant. 18, 4, 6, in the 20th year of Tiberius = 19 Aug. 786-787 (33-34 A.D.) and in the 37th year of his own reign = Summer 750 to 786-787 = 33-34. The new organization, 18, 4, 6 fin. fell however somewhat later, 34-35.

† Cf. Gesch. Chr. p. 228.

‡ Her brother Agrippa was 54 years old in the year 44, 19, 8, 2, and she herself was not only already born under Herod the Great, but already betrothed by him as a girl (Renan 109 fables about marriage without inclination) B. J. 1, 28, 1. 2; therefore surely at the year of Herod's death, 750, six years at least, or even ten years old, born then at latest 744, perhaps 740, therefore in the year 787 = 34 A.D., 43 or even 47 years old.

hand if any confidence is placed in the statement of the Gospels that the daughter of Herodias by her mother's strategy and her own skill in dancing gained the noble head of John, there is more chance of a solution. Salome, the only daughter of Herodias, the fruit of her first marriage, could only have been in her mother's house either before her marriage with the tetrarch Philip or after his death, and before her second marriage with Aristobulus, the nephew of Agrippa I.* The first assumption, *i.e.*, that the daughter on the occasion of her display of skill in dancing was a virgin, is quite out of the question, albeit the Gospels so represent her, and modern artifice has founded her marriage with Philip on his admiration of these dancing accomplishments; simply for the reason that Philip died in the year 33-34, had lived years before with Salome in childless wedlock, and the banquet and dancing-hall cannot possibly be pushed back into the year 20 odd.†

If accordingly Salome was present in her mother's house after the death of her first husband, still young enough at any rate, perhaps twenty years old or so, in that case this presence of hers, which was fraught with death to the Baptist, fell after the year 33-34 in which Philip her first consort had died.

In the history of Antipas there is only one point of significance; this is his journey to Rome, which began with the

* Ant. 18, 5, 4. A. the son of Herod, Prince of Chalcis, where he himself afterwards, from 52 (20, 7, 1) and as late as about 72 (B. J. 7, 7, 1) seems to have ruled.

† The artifice (on account of Matt. xiv. 11. Mark vi. 22-28) of Sepp and Gams cf. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 231. But also of Lichtenstein in the above passage, 593, and Wieseler in all the loc. cit. 548. These reckon as follows: John must have died a good time before the death of the Tetrarch Philip (end of 33 A.D.), for at the time of his death the young daughter of Herodias, afterwards Philip's wife, was still unmarried. Very well then: John arrested 28 or 29 (Lichtenstein Tabernacles 28, Wieseler Purim to Passover 29), killed about Easter 29. The journey of Antipas to Rome is reckoned by Wieseler for the beginning of 29: how promptly then do the arrest and death of John follow! Jesus' début according to Wieseler summer to autumn 27, Lichtenstein about Tabernacles 28. The fact that Salome had been some time married to Philip appears from Ant. 18, 5, 4, and 18, 4, 6, equally. In his last years he must have been building his sepulchre, 18, 4, 6, not just marrying.

seduction into marriage of Herodias, and closed with the flight of his first spouse, the Arabian princess.* This journey can consequently only have taken place in the year 30 odd, shortly before the rupture with the Arab king, and by no means as Van Til, Wieseler, and Hase without any ground assume, before the year of the fall of Tiberius' favourite Sejanus, that is before the year 31, according to Wieseler at the beginning of the year 29.†

Now in view of the mere order of narration in Josephus the assumption is natural that the journey of Antipas was connected with the death of Philip and the succession to his possessions.‡ Philip had died childless, and his land could only fall either to the Romans, or to the only son of Herod still reigning, to Antipas, unless the Emperor Tiberius in spite of his friendship with Antipas should raise the non-reigning brother, Herod, the consort of Herodias, the father of Philip's widow Salome, to the vacant throne. Such weighty issues were probably a justification of the journey to Rome, which the anxious and suspicious prince was not wont on other occasions lightly to undertake: it was here a question of taking a step towards the restoration of the large dominion of his father, which always (as we see later under Caligula) stood as an ideal goal before the eyes of his sons; and the attempt was cunningly supported by alienating Herodias and Salome from Herod, by the promise of marriage given to Herodias in

* Ant. 18, 5, 1.

† Wieseler, Synops. p. 242 ff. Wieseler especially champions the opinion that Antipas went to Rome in order to offer his condolence on the death of Livia, the empress dowager, and to beg for her inheritance in Judæa (since the death of Salome, cf. Vol. I. pp. 253 f., 260). Accordingly in the year 29. Success attended him, at least so far as the acquisition then made of Machærus. The worst of it is that Machærus did not belong to Livia, and that the Baptist, according to Wieseler himself was there pent aloft already since Purim 29! That Wieseler has also made a mistake about the residence of Antipas at this time, supposing there was no castle at Machærus, was shown p. 341. Cf. Gesch. Chr. 231-232.

‡ P. 390.

spite of her years, on the journey, which doubled his own claims and also enhanced the prospects of the ambitious Herodias herself. The installation by Tiberius he failed however to obtain, although Josephus speaks vaguely of his transacting his business in Rome: the friend in Rome was suspicious enough to decline the restoration of the kingdom of Herod the Great, since obviously in the Roman counsels after the dethronement of Archelaos the ultimate entire annexation of Palestine to the now tested Procuratorship and to the Province of Syria was already contemplated; at the most he gave him faint promises for the future, to which the half measure of Tiberius might point of annexing the tetrarchy of Philip to the province of Syria, and yet allowing the revenues of the tetrarchy to be deposited in that country as though it were still an integral self-subsistent whole.* The futility of this attempt of Antipas in Rome is moreover so little an objection against the whole construction of the motive of the Roman journey, that it rather places in its turn a subsequent occurrence in the clearest light. When Herodias somewhat later (38-39 A.D.) urged Antipas to a fresh journey to Rome with similar aims, to beg the title of King from the Emperor Caligula, the tetrarch was able to meet the headstrong ambitious woman, who ruled him, with a singularly prolonged opposition. Josephus explains it by his desire for tranquillity: but since he did not on other occasions exhibit this trait in any such measure, nothing is more natural than to suppose it was the warning of his previous similar journey which put him out of conceit of a second visit.† The result we arrive at is: if, as others perceive, it is in the highest degree likely, that the Roman expedition of Antipas was undertaken for the sake of the spoils of his deceased brother Philip, it must have taken place in the year 33-34, and at that very time, on this very journey the union with Herodias was brought to pass.‡ Finally

* Ant. 18, 4, 6. † Vol. I. p. 267. Ant. 18, 7, 1-2. ‡ Cf. Gams, p. 273.

even the history of King Agrippa I. does not refuse to afford some clue. Be it remembered that he stood in a threefold connexion with the above marriage: it was the marriage of his sister, the beginning of the marriage was his deliverance, its continuance fraught with danger to him, and by dint of his crafty counter-moves the ruin of his sister and brother-in-law. Now Hase indeed and Wieseler as well have thought that it was just the history of Agrippa that relegates his sister's union at least as far back as the year 32, and it is true we are bound very closely to scrutinize the facts.* The kernel to be here considered of the early and not exactly creditable history of Agrippa may be summed up in the statement, that he as a "high-spirited" contractor of debts in Rome, where he had resided since his boyhood (4 B.C.), unable to hold out there any longer at last ran away from his creditors to Palestine, buried himself in a tower called Malatha in Idumæa, the old home of Herod; in this sorry plight became a prey to melancholy so far as to meditate suicide, finally through a letter of entreaty addressed by his noble consort Cyprus to his sister Herodias already married to Antipas was rescued from his distress for the moment and called to Tiberias in Galilee, endowed with office and income.† When did the succour of his sister come to him? One might suppose soon after the death of Drusus the son of Tiberius who died in the year 23, since Josephus relates, that in his embarrassment in Rome, whose meshes he burst by flight, he had no resource in the Emperor, who to ward off sad reminiscences no longer permitted the approach of his son's friends. If however we look more closely, we see that Josephus by no means says that this inaccessibility of the Emperor only lasted for a short time after the death of his son, while the rest of the history shows that Tiberius with ever increasing moroseness and suspicion (especially after 26 A.D.),

* L. J. 5th Ed. p. 182. Wieseler p. 241 f. Cf. my *Gesch. Chr.* 231 f.

† Ant. 18, 6, 1-2 (controller of the market). First arrival in Rome shortly before the death of Herod the Great, § 1.

retired more and more from life to the solitude of Campania and Capreæ, and finally Suetonius shows that it was not till after the year 31, after the death of Sejanus and the report of his poisoning of Drusus, that the Emperor became inconsolable on account of his death; while further the history of Agrippa's life presupposes his entrance upon wedlock and the joys of fatherhood when in happier plight, that is still in Rome, towards the close of the second decade A.D., and last of all the length of his hermit life in Idumæa before his removal to Tiberias admits of no measurement.* On the other hand, however, we have other grounds for concluding with great certainty that it was only quite shortly before the year 36 that Agrippa experienced the help of his sister and brother-in-law. For in the spring of 36 he hastens thirsting for vengeance on his brother-in-law to Tiberius in Italy, after having quickly enough broken with his anything but magnanimous helper, then for a short time spent some pleasant days in Antioch in the neighbourhood of the Governor Pomponius Flaccus, which were put an end to by the hostile intrigues of his own brother Aristobulus, and after which he finally spent a short time against his will in Ptolemais, Anthedon and Alexandria, until he found money and freedom to run off to Italy.†

It is again no chary reckoning if for these transient hindrances to the journey we count from the summer of 35 to the

* The mourning for his son, though concealed, lasted long afterwards. Cf. the account of the year of his death, 776 = 23, in Tac. Ann. 4, 8 ff. Cf. c. 13: *negotia pro solatiis accipiens*. Sueton. Tib. 39; *sed orbatus utroque filio, quorum Germanicus in Syria, Drusus Romæ obierat, secessum Campaniæ petiit*. c. 52. a message of condolence sometime after the death (*legati paullo serius condolantes*). Still more important is the account of the year 31, Suet. Tib. 62: *auxit intenditque sævitiam exacerbatus indicio de morte filii sui Drusi*. See the whole passage. Also Wieseler, p. 241. Further we have to consider that Agrippa in his misfortunes about the year 33 has already a number of little children, and the eldest, Agrippa II., was in the year 44 17 years old (19, 9, 1), so that he was born 27-28 A.D.; Berenice, who was 16 years about 29: this marriage (with Cypras) however Agrippa of course contracted *not* after his misfortunes and after his flight into misery.

† B. J. 2, 9, 5. Ant. 18, 5, 3. 6, 2 f.

spring of 36, for the stay in Antioch with the Governor Flaccus the year 34-35, for the aid of sister and brother-in-law the year 34.* And should it be said this computation might rather serve as a proof of the contrary position, inasmuch as the marriage existed in the year 33-34, and perhaps had begun years before, it may not only be replied that all other indications forbid this assumption, but in particular that the letter of Cyprus, entreating help after these many cruel trials, cannot have been delayed for years, but must have made use of the first great turn in the fortunes of Herodias, her passage from private station to the throne.

By all these different modes of approach we reach again and again, and therefore with all the more certainty, the following chronology:—The abortive campaign, 37 A.D.; the battle between Jews and Arabians, 36; imprisonment and death of the Baptist, 34-35; public appearance of the Baptist, spring of 33-34; of Jesus, 34-35.† These calculations, arrived at

* Of these points the first requires no illustration (see Ant. 18, 6, 3), the sojourn with Flaccus is according to 18, 6, 3 somewhat longer, but not long. Of his sojourn in Tiberias however, Josephus says, 18, 6, 2: *οὐ μὴν ἐπὶ πλείον γε Ἡρώδης ἐνέμεινε τοῖς δειδογμένοις*. Ant. reproached him at a banquet in Tyros with his poverty and dependence. The sojourn of Flaccus in Syria can be still more exactly fixed. Consul in the year 17, (cf. concerning him also Sueton. Tiber. 42), he was governor of Syria in any case from 32 A.D. (Cf. Aelius Lamæa Tac. Ann. 6, 27, 6, 10): perhaps however much earlier (Cf. Gerlach, p. 52, who makes him out to have been in Syria since the year 22; Zumpt, since 32). But *how long* was he there? As a rule his death is put down, according to Tac. Ann. 6, 27, (Zumpt, Gerlach, Ewald 6, 290, Wieseler, also Pauly, Real-Enc.) in the year 33. In that case the sojourn of Agrippa with Flaccus would also be earlier. But Tacitus by no means says that Flaccus, but only that Aelius Lamæa the nominal governor of Syria died in 33. The death of Flaccus is only introduced by him in connexion with it in order to exhibit the inconsistencies of the Emp. Tiberius (Exin Flacco Pomp. Syriæ propraetore defuncto . . .). Flaccus may have been, and probably was, Governor until 34 or 35. This is supported (1) by the departure of Vitellius to Syria in the course of the year 35, (Ann. 6, 31-32); (2) by the ten years' detention, during the time of Flaccus, of Arruntius in Rome, who was appointed to Spain (Ann. 6, 27). Arruntius should have taken charge of Spain in place of the slain Piso in the year 25 or 26 (Ann. 4, 45), but was still in Rome 35-36. Accordingly the sojourn of Agrippa with Flaccus in 34, and even as late as 35, remains entirely unendangered.

† To be more precise the death of John preceded that of Jesus by scarcely the quarter of a year, cf. Matt. xiv. 12 f., xvi. 21, &c. My Gesch. Chr. 238. Spring

not without labour, it will always be less laborious to meet with the retort, that excepting the incidents of the years 37 and 36, they work more with probabilities than with definite figures; only let it be fairly acknowledged that such fixed figures are not possible here, and that in view of this impossibility the calculation of probabilities attains definite significance: in the second place that the approximations in question express an actual probability so high as to be really convincing, and such as would surely have satisfied even Winer had he been alive: finally, that the probabilities lend support to one another from the most diverse quarters, till the full fact stands out believed, and the decisive place in history is assigned to the years 33-35. Henceforth, I imagine, no one will again have a right to say that John died in prison in the year 29 or 30, since he demonstrably died but shortly before 36; henceforth no one will again push back the fresh marriage of the tetrarch into the year 26, since it was actually first seriously discussed in the battle of 36; henceforth none will again make the ministry of Jesus terminate, half with Luke and half with John, in the year 30-31, or even 33, since the conditions of his public appearance were not at that time in existence. Let us then divide in detail the few years and quarters of a year as we will, let scrupulous caution add one more link to our series of years, and relegate the enthronement of Herodias to the year 32-33, the imprisonment of the hated confessor to the year 33, his death to the year 34, the ministry of Jesus broadly to years 33-35; the main fact is after all retained, that the years 33-35

will be most readily assumed for the first public appearance whether of John or of Jesus: the gathering of the people in the wilderness is an argument for it. The winter and the burning heat of the summer in the wilderness of Jordan (B. J. 4, 8, 2) is surely excluded; one would therefore be reduced with Wieseler to supposing the only other alternative, the autumn. Even the dove with its propagative power, (more especially the turtle-dove, bird of passage, favourite bird, making its appearance in spring, Song of S. ii. 12), might be triflingly explained in this sense. Cf. Clem. Hom. 1, 6: ἐξ ἱαρινῆς τροπῆς λαβὼν τὴν ἀρχήν. This is said of Jesus' appearance; in spring-time already the Angel of God bears the message through the world, in the autumn there is a gathering in Rome. See the beautiful passage.

were the years made by John and Jesus momentous in the history of the world. With this large-hearted assumption the anxious friends of the fourth Gospel might surely rest content. Nothing indeed is more certain than the good understanding which the assumption of a one year's teaching for Jesus (34-35) establishes with the earlier Gospels, and we shall never conceal our profound allegiance to these latter writers; but if we allow a cautious-minded person the larger limits, he will find for the so-called three years of teaching in John right comfortable accommodation.*

Several small sources of contentment besides may accompany these results. Earlier and more recent calculators have also touched on or put in a plea for these years already, and a Jewish tradition names roundly the thirty-fifth year before the destruction of the Holy City, our year 35, by a quite independent reckoning, as the year of Jesus' death.† Then again, it is only three years which do justice to the twofold statement of the Gospels of Matthew and of John, that Jesus was born in the last years of King Herod, and that at the time of his ministry he was about forty years old.‡ Even the Acts of the Apostles gives its help: it has evidently placed the first early succession of the Apostles to the office and sufferings of the

* How little reliance is to be placed in this triad was shown in the Introduction, Vol. I. p. 166. Moreover, strictly taken, the 4th Gospel would only demand two years and a few weeks (somewhat more than three paschal feasts), were it not for the Samaritan spring (iv. 35). This alone (perhaps without the will of the writer) makes the third year necessary.

† For the year 33, at least as the final and fatal year of Jesus, Wieseler names Eusebius, Scaliger, Ussher, Ewald. Röscher for the year 34 E. v. Bunsen. Schrader holds the year 35 as the year of Jesus' death. Paul. 1, 36 ff. Sepp appeals to the Jewish book Juchasin, which names the 35th year before the destruction of Jerusalem, and so roundly the year 35, as the year of Jesus' death. Cf. Röscher loc. cit. p. 4 ff.

‡ John viii. 57. Ir. 2, 22. From 35 A.D. (788) we should come back (assuming 40 years) to 6 B.C. (748) as the year of Jesus' birth; and from 746-788 one would get c. 42 years. On the other hand, from 30 A.D. (783), we should reach 11 B.C.; much too early. Or in case of 30-33 representing the years of his life (783-30 or 33) we reach 753 (1 B.C.) or else 750 (4 B.C.); both too late, after or immediately before the death of Herod.

Lord in the year 36; and to the same year an accurate reckoning assigns the Damascan victory of Jesus over Paul, who, according to his own statements, had, like the Apostles, and soon after them, beheld the shining glory of the Risen One.* Finally, it will be thought worth knowing by many at this early stage, that according to the probable calculations of chronologists, the fifteenth of Nisan, the high day of the Passover, and the day of Jesus' death, might within the limits of the years thus fixed, at all events in the year 34, have fallen on a Friday, clearly fixed by the Gospels as the day of the week on which the cross was reared. Thus quite lately Wurm and Wieseler have reckoned. Only it is not to be forgotten that the chronological question is not by any means to be made dependent on this point of support, since Petavius, and after him Wurm again, have given warning enough of the uncertainty of the Jewish calendar.†

Is there any spiritual idiosyncrasy, any physiognomy of which this short section of years bears the stamp? We may ask this, not with any view of listening in the history of the

* Acts iv. 6 f., 27 ff., v. 17, decidedly presupposes the essential identity of the persons concerned in the trial of Jesus and the examination of the apostles. Even Pilate seems to be still upon the spot, at all events Annas and Caiaphas in a position of authority. Only, as men marked as belonging to the High-Priestly family, there are added John (Ant. 20, 1, 2 ?) and Alexander, (iv. 6) *i.e.* very probably (a frequent confusion) Jonathan ben Anna, the High Priest from Easter 36-37, (p. 386 f.) and Simon Kantheras, the son of Boëthos, High Priest under King Herod (Vol. I. p. 242), then again in the year 42, finally once more in 44 under the Emperor Claudius. Cf. Addenda. On the year of Paul's conversion we cannot here speak more particularly. Neander, Hausr. have also 36. Ussh. Pearson, Feilm. Hug, Meyer 35. Very important is 1 Cor. xv. 8.

† Cf. Wurm in Bengel's Archiv II., 2, 291 ff. Wieseler Synops. p. 446. Art. Zeitrechnung, p. 550. On the *uncertainty* of the Jewish Calendar however, cf. along with Wurm the warning of Petavius cited by the former himself, Doctr. Temp. xii., 11, *desinant itaque chronologi in anno dieque passionis eruendo mathematicorum calculis et noviluniorum pleniluniorumque minutis ac scrupulosis rationibus sibi ac lectoribus suis negotium facessere: quo in genere nimia sane quorundam περιεργία* exstitit. The execution on the High Festival, as the Synopt. give it, has, I may remark by the way, become more and more certain to me since Bleek's Beitr. 140 ff.: and even passages like 2 Sam. xxi. 9 (to which my colleague Büdinger drew my attention) and Matt. xxvii. 15 point significantly to primitive expiatory usages, which united themselves with this Feast in its two-fold significance.

time for the footfall of Jesus' activity, as yet invisible, or of guessing at his future success, which is not so altogether dependent on outward circumstance, but still in order vividly to realize the immediate basis that underlay his work, which actually did proceed upon a ground of such and such a character, at all events very likely drew from it incentives, impulses of attraction and repulsion, friendships and hostilities. But to the general and specific portraiture of the time, which the appearance of the Baptist so near in time, and but a little removed in space, brought before us, there is little to be added. It was, one may say, the decrepitude of the egregiously petty and profligate governments of Israel in which the public appearance of Jesus fell.

In Jerusalem Pilate was on the wane, as in Rome was his Emperor Tiberius, more feared in Rome than in the Holy Land, and ultimately despicable in his old age, under whom as once in Israel under Herod, he might be counted fortunate and worthy to be called a man, who was allowed to die by violence, or fate, or his own free will.*

The year 35 was the last full year of Pilate's rule, and the people's transition to the last and most hopeful stage of their resistance, when the place of sedition and of silence was taken by peaceable appeal to the Emperor, such as was made about the year 32, had rendered the tyrant, trembling in prospect of his inevitable trial before the Emperor, rather more cautious and somewhat inclined to yield to the populace and its leaders, the latter not to the advantage of Jesus' cause.† Gladly, however, did he still display his hyena-like nature, where he thought himself in the right against movers of sedition, as for instance, against the Samaritans in the year 35, with whose blood he sealed his own fate, as well as almost at the same time against the Galilæan

* Cf. Tac. Ann. 6, 38 ff. Herod, Vol. I. p. 252. The time of John, p. 223 f.

† Jos. B. J. 2, 9, 4 (after the first bloody resistances to Pilate): *πρὸς δὲ τὴν συμφορὰν τῶν ἀνηρημένων καταπλάγην τὸ πλῆθος ἐσιώπησεν*. The appeal to the Emperor (about 32) Vol. I. p. 301.

guests at the feast in Jerusalem.* In the home of Jesus the princely perversities of the wretched Antipas were rather on the increase. Now the disgraceful marriage, and the sway of the woman : now the attack upon the prophet and the war with Arabia, now simultaneously with the breach with public opinion, —the convulsively jealous cementing of his friendship with Rome, the fawning on Vitellius, the secret messages to Rome, the meddling in Roman politics, the laughable playing at the part of mediator between Rome and Scythia, the begging for Roman legions against Arabia, and the procession of Roman Eagles through Galilee.† More pleasing is the picture presented by the people. It is more alive ; once again a palpable visible reality, whereas at other times only the masters are on the field, and allow us to infer a people : in its actions it is more considerate and goes deeper. Now it is the associate in the Baptist's plans of a Kingdom, instinct with hopes that reached to Samaria, now the accuser of Pilate : now the moral verdict on the tetrarch. At this point of time did Jesus arise ; this time of saddest situations, and faintly stirring hopes. One cannot help reflecting——a brief moment after Jesus' departure Israel's sky became so much clearer, as in the years 36-39, one after another, Pilate, Caiaphas, Tiberius, Antipas sank in the dust, and first Lucius Vitellius, the plenipotentiary of the East, the lenient and prudent guardian of the eastern frontier against the Parthians, then Agrippa I. the new King of Israel, inaugurated a new age of happiness for that people. Would not the fate of Jesus have been different if he had appeared but a moment later, under Agrippa ? But in the first place a religious mode of viewing affairs might suggest the question : was it not just his fate which brought on his adversaries and judges

* Vol. I. p. 260. Ewald, p. 36f. brings the latter and more besides (the rising of Barabbas, the fall of the tower of Siloah) into close connexion with the revolt on account of the water supply : but this is much earlier (Vol. I. pp. 261, 300), and the murder of the Galilæans must fall in the middle of the third decade.

† Ant. 18, 4, 5.

their fate, and for Israel a turn of fortune? Then, again, that joyously welcomed turn of fortune was so delusively short, as was the belief in Caligula, the madman among the Cæsars, and even in its short duration more outward than inward, a bribing of the nation to the content of lethargy. . But what is most certain of all is that the work of Jesus troubled itself as little about the sunshine and the storm of earthly princes, whether their names were Antipas or Agrippa, as about the approval or condemnation of the great crowd, and that the highest need of the awakened nation favoured the painful birth of the new highest religion of spiritual Ideals, as most of all did its first reception and nurture by true warm living hearts and hands.* In this moment then of wonderful suspense, of sorest need, and of most anxious quest, Jesus arose.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

P. 3, Note. Also in Ant. 8, 2, 3 as early as the time of Solomon the name of Galilee appears in Josephus.

P. 9, Note 1. Compare again the conflict by Taricheæ Ant. 14, 7, 3.

P. 14. Observe the extraordinary combativeness of the Galilæan Alexander Jannæas. Jael also deserves mention, the wife of the Kenite, the terrible heroine in the war with Sisera. Judges iv. 17ff.

P. 20. Furrer reckons between Sepphoris and Nazara only two leagues and three quarters of a mile.

P. 21. Also a series of villages in the great plain, *i.e.*, most likely the plain of Jezreel, had, probably on account of the predominance of a non-Jewish population been withdrawn from the Hasmoneans from the times of Pompey and Gabinius to those of Cæsar. Jos. Ant. 14, 10, 6.

P. 77. For the other form of the account in Toledoth cf. page 101, Note 2.

* Jesus confronting the judgment of people and prince, p. 351.

P. 110. The Essay : Tradition and Rechnung über den Geburtstag Jesu by Nawars, Kath. Quartalschrift, 1867, 2, has not yet reached me.

P. 127, Note 1. These are weak conjectures : see for the like Jablonsky and Wieseler, Synopsis, p. 133 ff.

P. 128. Wieseler, too, is somewhat shy of the Heathen festival brought in by Petav. Hard. Jabl. He overlooks the fact that the four Christianized Julian points of division in the year (25 March, Annunciation : 24 June, Birth of the Baptist : 24 Sept., Conception of Elizabeth : 25 Dec., Birth of Christ) have only obtained support and sanction from the 25th of December.

P. 144. Jerome's view of the brothers of the Lord as cousins : also V. I. 2.

P. 257. Cf. Onias in a certain sense the last prophet before John, with Vol. I. page 307.

P. 277, Note 2. Justin certainly regarded the Baptism as first of all a mark for recognizing Him who was not merely a carpenter (*γνώρισμα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*) ; but his conception according to its expression and further development in the principal passage reaches beyond this.

P. 304. Cf. Bab. Erubh. 7, 19, 1 apud Lightfoot 286 : tria sunt ostia gehennæ : unum in eremo (Numb. xvi. 33) alterum in mari (Jonah ii. 3), tertium apud Hierosolymas (Is. xxxi. 9). Cf. Matt. iv. 1.—Apocal. xiii. 1.—Matt. v. 22.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

- Page 15.—*Last note, third line*, for “more than,” read “only in former times.”
- „ 18.—*Last line but 4*, after “at any rate,” omit “to.”
- „ 24.—*Commencement of third paragraph*, for “relations . . . to,” read “circumstances . . . and.”
- „ 48.—*Line 12 f.* for “his “fiftieth year, very,” read “the year 50 odd, to put it.”
- „ 69.—*Line 19*, for “this,” read “these.”
- „ 78.—*Line 12*, for “Procurators,” read “Procurator.”
- „ 81.—*Note 2, line 3*, for “146 + 6,” read “14 + 66.”
- „ 97.—*Line 7*, for “New,” read “Greek of the Old.”
- „ 114.—*Eight lines from below*, for “781,” read “788.”
- „ 123.—*Two lines from below*, for “731,” read “711.”
- „ 123.—*Note 2, last line but one*, after “cf. p.” read “233 in Vol. I.”
- „ 127.—*End of paragraph*, add “Epiphanius too names the night of Jan. 5-6 as the birthday of the Lord.”
- „ 127.—*Note 1, last line but 3*, for “14th,” read “15th.”
- „ 138.—*Note 1, end*, for “mass,” read “map.”
- „ 153.—*Line 7*, for “Caius” read “Emperor.”
- „ 180.—*Last line but 9*, for “their general tone of sentiment in their,” read “of sincere intention, of,” &c.
- „ 194.—*Note*, for “Gen.” read “Ex.”, as also 207, *first note*.
- „ 223.—*Line 13*, for “strained their authority to the utmost,” read “made their fortune by extortion.”
- „ 307.—*Line 12*, for “defects,” read “defeats.”
- „ 347.—*Last line but one*, for “temptations such as beset,” read “attempts such as engaged.”
- „ 347.—*First note*, for “*dénouement*,” read “displacement.”
- „ 368.—*Seven lines from below*, for “latter,” read “former.”
- „ 371.—*Note 4*, for “10th,” read “16th.”
- „ 398.—*Last line but 5*, for “three,” read “these.”

2 vols
72

Likeness of Christ 189

2 vols
V52

130364 Bible
130364 Comment(N.T.)
K
Author Keim, Theodore
Title The history of Jesus of Nazara. Vol.2

**University of Toronto
Library**

**DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET**

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

